Fundamentals of Scientific Socialism

Progress Publishers

The authors are professors of the Moscow Institute of Social Sciences: philosophers, historians, economists, political analysts. They wrote many other works and textbooks on sociopolitical subjects. The team is headed by Prof. G.P. Chernikov, Dr.Sc. (Economics).

Fundamentals of Scientific Socialism

Progress Publishers
Moscow

Guides to the Social Sciences

Translated from the Russian by *Gayane Chalyan*

Учебные пособия по общественным наукам

НАЧАЛЬНЫЙ КУРС НАУЧНОГО СОЦИАЛИЗМА

Авторский коллектив: *Черников Г.* (руководитель), *Андрес Э., Гилилов Л., Гудожник Г., Захаров Ф., Кремер И., Логинов В., Рындина М., Суханова В.*

На английском языке

© Progress Publishers 1988

Н $\frac{0302030000-301}{014(01)-88}$ 22—88

ISBN 5-01-000446-1

CONTENTS

Introduction . 7

Chapter One. FOUNDATIONS OF THE MATERIALIST OUTLOOK 15
In Search of Truth 15
Development of the Scientific World Outlook 18
Scientific Socialism on the Surrounding World 19
Dialectical Materialism 20
Development of the Science of Society 23
Revolution in the Outlook on Society . 25
Production Is the Basis of Social Life 26
Social Being and Social Consciousness . 29
The Interaction of Being and Consciousness 31

Chapter Two. PRE-SOCIALIST STAGES OF MANKIND'S EVOLUTION 33
The Primitive Community 33
The Period of Appropriation . . . 34
The Period of Reproducing Economy 35
Remnants of Primitive-Communal Relations and Their Impact Today 36
The Slave-Owning Socio-Economic Formation 37
The Rise of Transitional Societies 37
Formation of Classes. The Emergence of the State 38
Evolution of Slave-Owning 40
Disintegration of the Slave-Owning System 42
The Feudal Formation . 43
Evolution of Feudalism 43
Distinctions of the Feudal Mode of Production . 44
Characteristic Features of Feudalism's Development 45
The Struggle Against Feudalism. Remnants of Feudalism Today 47
The Capitalist Formation . 48
Emergence of Capitalism 48
Social Revolution . . . 49
What Is Capitalist Society? . . 51
Class Struggle Under Capitalism . . . 55
Imperialism: the Eve of Socialist Revolution 59

Chapter Three. THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION AND THE EXPERIENCE OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION 63
How a Marxist Party Was Built Up in Russia . . . 63
The Programme of the Party's Revolutionary Struggle 64
The Strategy and Tactics of Revolution 67
The Downfall of Tsarism 71
The Peaceful Stage in the Revolution's Development 73
The Bolsheviks' Course of an Armed Uprising 75
The Revolution Triumphs . . 77
The Civil War and Intervention . . 79
The Building of a Working-People State 81
Towards a Society of Social Justice 82
Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics 86
Industrialisation of the Country 87
Collectivisation of Agriculture 89
The Cultural Revolution 91
The Transformation of National Outskirts 94
Socialism's Victory 96

Chapter Four. CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH. THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM 100
The Epoch of Transition to Socialism 100
The Contradictions of Our Age 102
The Interaction of Forces in the World Revolutionary Process 104
The USSR Today 108
The Strategy of Acceleration . 110
The Community of Socialist States . . . 114
The Common Features of Socialist Construction 116

Chapter Five. THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM. THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT IN CAPITALIST COUNTRIES 120
The Distinguishing Features of the Crisis 120
The Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Bourgeois World 121
The Onslaught on the Working People's Rights 123
Intra-Imperialist Contradictions . . 125
The Working-Class Movement Grows 126

Chapter Six. ANTI-IMPERIALIST EMANCIPATORY STRUGGLE 129
Colonialism and Neocolonialism . . . 129
The History of Colonialism and Its Crisis . 129
The Role of the National Liberation Struggle 134
Two Ways of Development . . 138
The States of Socialist Orientation 143

Chapter Seven. THE VANGUARD OF SOCIAL PROGRESS 148
The Fight for Workers' Interests 148
The Strategy and Tactics of Communist Parties in Capitalist Countries 153

Communists of Asian and African Countries 156
Revolutionary Processes in Latin American Countries . . 162
Proletarian Internationalism Ensures the Success of All Democratic Movements 165

Chapter Eight. THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS 169
War and Peace Issues After World War II 169
How Imperialism Acts Today 174
Communists and Peace . . 178
Peace Can Be Safeguarded 189

Conclusion 196

To the Reader 203

INTRODUCTION

The world around us is beautiful, with all its woods and meadows, oceans and rivers, valleys and mountains. Even in deserts and on permafrost—hard as life there may be—man can live happily, transforming nature by his labour to make it still more beautiful.

For thousands of years, however, most people lived in sorrow and hardship. Inequality emerged when wealth created through collective efforts began to be appropriated by small groups of people. Since that time, the majority of people worked, while the minority enjoyed the fruits of their labour. At a certain stage of history, the class of exploiters set up the state to help it dominate society.

Such social arrangements existed for several thousand years; the overwhelming majority of people in society were subservient to the minority. The labour of the poor majority ensured a better life for the rich minority and their servants—government officials, police officers, and soldiers.

Generation after generation fought against oppressors and exploiters. Men cherished the dream of a just social system, a society undivided into the rich and the poor. They waged a bitter struggle for the happiness of all people. Many honest and courageous men laid down their lives for the success of that struggle.

The working people's fight, however, always ended in defeat, taking a toll of many lives. Who can say now how many people died because they were humiliated and downtrodden in many different ways? The society of private ownership and exploitation could give working people nothing but pain and misery.

It was only in the 19th century, when the development of in-

dustrial production brought about a new class—the proletariat—that, at last, there emerged the force capable, in alliance with other working people, of doing away with a society of exploitation. Industrial workers own no land, workshop or trading store. They possess only labour power, the ability to work and create material and cultural values. Capitalists—those who own factories, banks, railway lines, etc.—exploit industrial workers. An organised force due to the specific nature of their work, the proletariat moved into action against the exploiters. But workers needed to know who their friends and enemies were, and how to fight for their own interests and for the interests of all working people.

The system of knowledge, the theory of ways and methods of the proletariat's struggle, was created in the last century by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. That theory was named Marxism, after its principal founder.

Karl Marx was born in Germany in 1818 into a lawyer's family. He saw the injustice reigning in society, and was on the side of the downtrodden and exploited since his youth. Marx devoted his whole life to the creation and implementation of the theory of revolution.

Marx was a real hard worker. A person of remarkable abilities, he was able to examine the life of society in depth, to study works of scholars before his time and those of his contemporaries, and to utilise their accomplishments in his own work. Marx reassessed and elaborated the basic ideological theories that originated in the then most advanced countries—Germany, England, and France. The theory of the essence of nature and man had been profoundly expounded in the works of German philosophers. English economists examined the role of wage labour in the creation of society's wealth. In France, where several social revolutions had occurred in the late 18th and the 19th centuries, the theory of a just social order had acquired wide currency.

However, Marx was not a mere follower of other philosophers. He created a new theory—the theory of scientific socialism, reflecting the vital interests of the proletariat.

Frederick Engels, too, made a great contribution to the founding of the theory of revolution. Marx wrote many of his works together with Engels, his true and loyal friend. One might say that the theory of emancipation from exploitation was created

by the two scholars and revolutionaries, whose relationship surpassed all known examples of human friendship. All his life Engels helped Marx in theoretical work, social activity and in practical matters. Marx died before the completion of his greatest work, *Capital*, so Engels devoted his last years to getting the second and third volumes of the book prepared for publication.

Even the opponents of Marx and Engels recognise the theoretical consistency and logic of their views.

The theory of scientific socialism is a system of knowledge embracing the most general laws governing the development of nature and society, the advance of social production, emancipatory struggle of the working people, revolution, and creation of a just—socialist—society. Its foundation is correct understanding of the surrounding world. The first component of Marxist theory is philosophy—the science of the laws governing the development of nature and human society. The second component—political economy—studies the relations shaping up among people in the process of labour. Called production relations, they comprise the foundation of a grand building—society. The building itself, and what occurs within it is largely determined by the way the foundation is laid.

The third component is scientific socialism—the theory of the struggle waged by the working class together with all working people to eliminate exploitation and build a new—socialist—society.

Marx and Engels were not mere theoreticians: they were outstanding organisers of revolutionary movement, who were persecuted by police in several countries for their participation in the 1848-1849 revolution. Marx and Engels set up the Communist League—the first ever working-people organisation to engage in revolutionary struggle against the forces of reaction. They organised and for ten years led the International Working Men's Association (the First International).

Marx and Engels were not able to complete the implementation of their theory: Marx died in 1883 and Engels—in 1895.

At the time, the person who was destined to advance and implement the Marxian revolutionary theory had already commenced his revolutionary activities. This man was Lenin, the founder of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, organiser of the greatest social revolution of the 20th century—the

October 1917 Socialist Revolution in Russia, founder of the world's first socialist state and leader of the international working class and all working people. Lenin's contribution to the revolutionary theory and practice is so great that this theory is today called Marxism-Leninism.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (Ulyanov) was born into the family of a Russian teacher in 1870. His parents, like those of Marx, were no revolutionaries. They saw their highest aim in life in serving the people, and taught their children to be honest and industrious.

Lenin was a confirmed Marxist from the very early days of his revolutionary activity. He was dedicated to the cause of emancipating the working class and all working people from exploitation and oppression, to the cause of building a new society.

In the new historical conditions, Lenin gave answers to the questions posed by society's development after the death of Marx and Engels. Having examined the achievements of science and social movements in the 20th century, Lenin elaborated on Marxian theory and produced an economic theory of the 20th-century society which, like his other theories, retains its significance even today. Lenin developed the theory of class struggle—the struggle for the elimination of the old and creation of a new and just society—and armed the working-class movement with the theory of socialist revolution and construction, as well as a scientific view of the problems of war and peace.

Like Marx and Engels, Lenin was more than a scholar and promoter of revolutionary theory; he was also a skilled organiser of broad masses for the struggle against oppressors.

Lenin saw the major prerequisite of success in the organisation and strengthening of a party of the working class and all working people, a worldwide alliance of revolutionaries. In 1917, under the guidance of Lenin's party, which combined scientific socialism with the revolutionary movement, the Russian working class, peasants, and intelligentsia effected the Great October Socialist Revolution and built the first ever working people's state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The socialist revolution in Russia is the major historical event of the 20th century. It opened up a new epoch in mankind's development—transition from the old society of exploitation,

coercion and wars to a new society of equality and social justice.

After the victory of the Revolution, Lenin concentrated on the plan of building a socialist society. Its implementation was completed after his death, which occurred in 1924. Lenin was mourned by millions of working people of all races and nationalities in many countries of the world. After paying their last tribute to their leader, thousands of working people in the Soviet Union joined the ranks of revolutionary fighters, the Communist Party.

The flame of the revolution kindled in October 1917 embraced other countries. The rise of the workers' movement facilitated the emergence and spread of Marxist Communist parties.

After German Nazism and Japanese militarism were routed in the Second World War (1939-1945), the worldwide historic process of social emancipation commenced by the Great October Revolution resulted in the overthrow of the rule of exploiters in a number of European and Asian, and later in some Latin American countries. Thus socialism, initially a reality of one country, became a worldwide system.

The struggle of those nations which for centuries were downtrodden by foreign exploiters has been of great importance for mankind's social development. Under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the progress of working-class movements, the triumph of socialism in the USSR and the defeat of Nazism in the Second World War, to which the Soviet Union contributed more than any other country, the struggle for national emancipation took the form of national liberation revolutions. Today, the once oppressed colonies are young independent states with more than half of the world's total population. They have taken the road of independent history-making.

The international communist and working-class movement and the mass democratic movement are becoming increasingly important.

The revolutionary struggle for social and national emancipation is not yet over. The young and advancing world of socialism and national liberation is opposed by the still powerful and dangerous capitalist world of exploitation. The class of exploiters owns huge material, military and other resources. It tramples

on the rights of the working people, attempts to split the alliance of revolutionary forces and poison ordinary people's minds with lies and falsifications. To be able to resist the oppressors, it is necessary to have a sound knowledge of the surrounding world, the laws of social life, and the methods of waging revolutionary struggle in present conditions.

Today, therefore, every revolutionary, every honest person needs a scientific revolutionary theory. Today, as before, Marxism-Leninism is the beacon showing the way to a just society. More should be added: today the significance of the theory of scientific socialism has considerably increased.

This is explained by a number of factors. First, by the emergence and advancement of the world socialist system. Socialism is being built in countries with different levels of industrial development and different historical and national traditions. Each of these countries is building a new society with an eye on these differences, and is thus adding to the general experience of socialist construction. The second factor is the ideological problems connected with the world socialist system's increased impact on international development and the fact that socialism is becoming the main road of mankind's social development. Third, the role of scientific socialism is enhancing because the numerical strength of revolutionary movements is constantly on the increase. The fourth factor, lending ever more weight to the role of scientific socialism, is the revolution in outlook, the spread of progressive ideas among society.

The obtaining socio-political situation, therefore, demands that true revolutionaries must have a genuinely scientific view of the world and approach to the ways and methods of its cognition and transformation. Those countries that have chosen the socialist road are faced with an ever more urgent need for a creative revolutionary theory. It is especially important for the political vanguard of these countries to be sure of final victory, of the correctness of the chosen path—an attitude that produces revolutionary enthusiasm.

The increasingly complicated nature of the revolutionary process makes further elaboration and skilful application of Marxism-Leninism as important as the wide circulation of the Marxist-Leninist outlook.

Scientific socialism was and is a living and creative theory.

It was born by the proletariat's revolutionary endeavour and has been developing in the course of contemporary social struggle. Today, the Marxist-Leninist theory is still being elaborated in the works of revolutionaries in all countries and by the practical activities of Communist, Workers', and revolutionary-democratic parties.

It is of particular importance to be able to apply the theory of revolution to the real conditions obtaining in each particular country. For this, as the experience accumulated in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries shows, it is necessary to have a sound knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory and of the situation in each particular country. It is also necessary to bear in mind that it is dangerous to automatically transfer the experience beneficial in some particular conditions to different conditions—that demand new solutions to social problems.

There is still another danger: revisionism. Pointing to the changed conditions, revisionists reject the essence of Marxism-Leninism, its theory of socialist revolution; they seek to substitute it with various theories of cooperation with the exploiters. Revisionism distorts the views of Marx and Engels and belittles Lenin's contribution; therefore, the struggle against it is a major task of all consistent revolutionaries, and is of special importance in the present conditions marked by increased activity of the class enemy.

The forces of imperialism, led by reactionary circles in the United States, have launched a broad offensive against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They seek to rally all advocates of the old social order in an onslaught against the revolutionary transformation of the world. To achieve this, they employ diverse means and methods. The most dangerous of these is the alliance of military industrialists, generals, and higher government officials, those who derive immense profits from the production and accumulation of weapons, the preparation and conduct of wars of aggression. The military-industrial complex is pushing the world to the brink of a new world war.

The most acute problem facing mankind today is the peace problem. The exploiter society bears the blame for two world wars that took a toll of many million lives. Today, too, it threatens to trigger a third world war.

Today, when the world has huge stockpiles of mass destruction weapons, a world war would be catastrophic. A war with the use of modern mass destruction weapons threatens the existence of mankind, the very life on Earth.

Never has the danger to mankind been so real, but never have there been so many real possibilities for preserving and consolidating peace.

All honest people are rising up in defence of peace and happiness on Earth. In their efforts, they rely on scientific socialism—a humanitarian revolutionary theory reflecting the interests of the working people.

Marxism-Leninism holds that notwithstanding the great threat to peace created by aggressive policies of the reactionary forces of exploiter society, a new world war is not inevitable. It is possible to avert war and save mankind from disaster. This is the historical objective of socialism and all progressive and peace-loving forces of our planet. Constant growth and interaction of these forces would serve to implement nations' aspiration for a peaceful, free, and happy life.

It is not a simple or easy task to master Marxism-Leninism: it requires time and effort.

The present book deals with the fundamentals of revolutionary theory. It goes without saying that it is impossible to convey the wealth of Marxism-Leninism in one book. That is why, for those who would like to continue the study of the theory of revolution, the authors have appended recommendations and a list of major works by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, as well as other helpful sources.

The teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin meets the cardinal interests of the working people. This is testified by the history of mankind's development in the 20th century.

Chapter One

FOUNDATIONS OF THE MATERIALIST OUTLOOK

To be able to fight for a better life in a revolutionary spirit, conscientiously and purposefully, one must understand the world around. To put it differently, a revolutionary must have a scientific outlook, that is to say, a system of views capable of correctly reflecting the real world and of guiding him in the revolutionary struggle. A scientific and materialist outlook has become possible as a result of a long historical development.

In Search of Truth

As far back as in hoary antiquity, man sought to understand the essence of natural phenomena—the sun, forests, mountains, rivers, etc. At first man thought that the world was eternal, was never created and would exist forever. As man developed, so did his concepts of the environment. Reflecting on life, man reasoned more or less like this: I have made a tool, built a fire, grown a plant, built a house. Someone must have made the sun, mountains and rivers, and grown the forest. I could not do this for I am small and weak. He who created the sun, the hills and the world must be a supernatural being.

Gradually, however, man began to have doubts about the existence of supernatural forces. The doubts became stronger with the development of his abilities and understanding of the surrounding world. Delving into the essence of things, man could not find a god.

Thus originated two answers to the cardinal question, the solution of which determines the understanding of the surround-

ing world. The two cardinally different explanations of the surrounding world were widespread as far back as in ancient times. They initiated the development of philosophy.[1]

Philosophers fell into two groups in accordance with their views on the world.

One group asserted that the world was eternal. Of course, the world changes: rivers flow; ponds dry up in one place to appear in another; trees grow, die and then reappear, etc. Something always remains though: things do not disappear completely or appear from nowhere. The ever existing and ever changing but never completely disappearing substance was called matter or material. So the doctrine of philosophy according to which matter is the ever-existing substance of the world was named materialism.

The other doctrine attributed the existence of the world to the activities of a supernatural being or development of an idea. Advocates of this doctrine reasoned as follows: here are three men—a tall man, a short man, and a fat man. What is essential to all of them? Is it that which distinguishes them from each other? No. Essential to them is that they are all human beings: each of them is a man. But where is man? Not a tall man or a short man but man as such? We cannot see him. One man will die and disappear; another will appear; many others will appear—who will also disappear for others to take their place, etc. What is permanent and eternal? It is *the idea of man* which we cannot see; though not observable, it is the essence of man; it creates and destroys man.

Those philosophers reasoned in a similar manner about other things, too: animals, trees, mountains, rivers, etc., and decided that there is an eternal and never-changing idea that creates all things, destroys them and creates them anew. According to them, there exist two worlds: the world of observable things surrounding us and the world of ideas that cannot be perceived. These ideas form the essence of the world of things. This philosophic doctrine is called idealism.

In the 18th century, there branched out an idealist theory

---

[1] Philosophy ("love of wisdom", from Greek *philo*—love and *sophia*—wisdom) is the system of the most generalised concepts of the world and man's place in it.

holding that the idea creating the world originates in man's sensations. One of its founders reasoned thus: Here is an apple. What is an apple? It is something sour, sweet, red, etc. What is sour, sweet, red? It is my own sensations. I perceive sour, sweet, red, and by an act of volition create a certain combination of them which I call an apple. I can create another combination out of my sensations, and hence create another object. All objects, therefore, are various combinations of my own sensations. There are no objects, things; there is no world without my sensations, outside me. Hence the world is the result of the functioning of man's—the subject's—mind. That doctrine is called subjective idealism, while the other branch of idealism is called objective idealism, since its advocates assert that the world-creating idea exists outside man, i.e. objectively.

The attempts to apprehend the world around him led man to another very important question: is he able to correctly perceive and cognise the world, acquire true knowledge of what is primary in the world, the idea or matter? In the search for the answer the thinkers advanced two diametrically opposite points of view: (1) man is capable of cognising the world and acquiring true knowledge; (2) man is lacking the abilities needed to acquire the true knowledge about the world.

Materialists hold that having acquired primary knowledge of objects through sensations, man analyses them, reveals their interconnections and establishes their similarities and distinctions. As a result of his mental work, he acquires knowledge much deeper than that obtained through sensations.

There is yet another question the approach to which gave rise to two schools of thought. It deals not with the basis of the world, but with the mode of its existence. Irrespective of what is recognised as the basis of the world—the idea or matter—the question arises whether it is in a state of change, development, transformation, or whether it is never changing. The school of thought according to which the basis of the world and the world as a whole are in constant change and development and all phenomena are in interaction is called dialectics; the opposite school of thought, according to which the basis of the world and the entire world are given once and for all and are never-changing, is called metaphysics.

So these explanations of the surrounding world form the

principal schools of thought in philosophy: materialism and idealism, dialectics and metaphysics.

If one wants to grasp the fundamentals of scientific socialism, it is essential that he should know the principal schools of thought.

Development of the Scientific World Outlook

The scientific world outlook based on materialism and dialectics, and the unscientific world outlook based on idealism and metaphysics have been at grips throughout the entire history of mankind up to the present day.

The struggle between philosophic schools is related to the struggles of various social forces, various groups of people.

In their struggle, both materialist and idealist philosophers turn to new facts and new scientific achievements in an effort to substantiate their positions. As a result, philosophical thought develops together with the advance of human society, producing a multitude of various philosophical theories, both materialist and idealist.

Thinkers in ancient India, China, Greece, and Rome achieved great heights in philosophy. In the Middle Ages (from the end of the first millennium to the beginning of the second), philosophical thought in the Arab East attained a high level. Throughout the 16th-18th centuries philosophy progressed in Europe. The development of philosophy in England and France during the 17th and 18th centuries was based on the materialist understanding of the surrounding world. The German philosophical thought developed a dialectical approach to all processes and phenomena. However, the predominant view was that the interaction and development of all phenomena are caused by changes in the absolute idea, the spirit. This serious drawback apart, German dialectics made a substantial contribution to the development of world philosophical thought.

Of particular interest is the development of the philosophy of revolutionary democratism. As a social phenomenon, it stemmed from the specific conditions obtaining in the countries that had, due to a number of reasons, been several steps behind the general level of historical progress in the 19th and 20th centuries. Revolutionary democratism has an international character,

though it emerges at different times in different countries.

The philosophical foundations of revolutionary democratism are shaped by historical conditions and socio-political traditions of a given country. More often than not, the philosophic views of revolutionary democrats were inconsistent, combining a variety of contradictory concepts. At the same time, the concrete situation of revolutionary struggle encouraged in most of them a desire for scientific knowledge and a critical attitude toward predominating idealist concepts.

The materialist trend found vivid expression in the philosophical outlook of the 19th-century revolutionary democrats in Russia. However, they were not able to overcome their idealistic understanding of social development.

The study of the history of materialism and idealism shows that, notwithstanding its limited knowledge of man and external world, philosophical materialism in all its forms facilitated scientific cognition and the emergence of a scientific concept of the world. It was gradually becoming the philosophy of the most advanced individuals and social groups.

Scientific Socialism on the Surrounding World

By the middle of the 19th century, the working masses' struggle, particularly that of factory workers, had acquired a scope that clearly showed that the toiling people were a great social force capable of exerting a powerful influence on all aspects of social life.

The interests of the working class and all working people found expression in the international philosophical doctrine of Marx and Engels, which explained the arrangement of the world and laws of social development, and outlined the road toward building a just society. Lenin substantially advanced the doctrine of Marx and Engels.

Creating the foundations of a scientific world outlook, Marx and Engels were able to overcome the drawbacks of preceding materialist doctrines treating matter in a very narrow sense and reducing it to something that can be perceived by sense organs, something that can be seen, touched, etc. When science discovered some new phenomena, of the kind that cannot be perceived directly (for example, magnetic waves or particles not vis-

ible to the eye), these phenomena were not matter from the point of view of pre-Marxian materialists. Also, the latter's approach to the question of the motion of matter was wrong: they did not understand that matter all the time changes, develops, and is transformed, and that qualitatively new phenomena, processes and objects appear in the world in the course of development. They understood the motion of matter very narrowly, as the movement of bodies in space, and recognised only the mechanical motion or quantitative change (the increase or decrease) of the existing things.

Reducing the motion of matter to the movement of bodies in space, those philosophers could not explain the source of movement, could not answer the question of why matter moves at all. They asserted that one particular body moves because another body had given it a push. They had no explanation for the motion of matter in general. Holding that there is only mechanical motion in the world, pre-Marxian materialists inevitably arrived at the conclusion that the motion of matter is caused by some non-material, supernatural force.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin were able to overcome the drawbacks of preceding materialist doctrines and enrich the materialist outlook on the basis of the achievements of science and social life. For the first time ever, philosophy became the doctrine of the working masses, the theory of their struggle for a new life.

Dialectical Materialism

The foundations of the theory of matter are as follows. Matter is the multitude of objects and phenomena, including their properties and relationships, existing independently of man or his conscience. It goes without saying that there exists an infinite variety of things, phenomena, and processes. Notwithstanding their differences, all things, phenomena, and processes have a common foundation: they are all material. They appear, change, cease to exist, etc., but never disappear completely. They neither arise from nothing nor turn into nothing; they can only change from one state into another. Matter is that from which everything arises and into which everything turns; matter is eternal.

The following example may help us understand what matter is. Imagine that you are at sea in a boat. You scoop up water, toss it up into the air, and it turns into drops. When these drops fall back into the sea, they disappear. The drops have come from sea water and returned to sea water. Matter is such world "sea water", from which everything comes and into which everything goes.

Matter's mode of existence is constant motion. Marx, Engels, and Lenin relied on the advanced scientific data of their time and hence treated the motion of matter in a deeper and broader sense than all preceding materialists, adding to their doctrine two relevant positions: the origin of motion and the nature of motion. The Marxist-Leninist theory holds that there are many different forms and types of motion. Apart from purely mechanical motion, there are also physical motion—the motion and interaction of minute particles of matter; chemical motion—processes whereby various substances and compounds are formed; biological motion—processes of organic (microbe, plant and animal) life. Social life is the highest form of the motion of matter. The forms interact, and this interaction is the source of motion of all matter. The source of motion, therefore, is within matter and not without (as advocates of the "primeval torque" think); it is inherent in matter.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin approached matter from the dialectical position which holds that all phenomena are interrelated and are constantly interacting, changing, developing. Interaction, the struggle between various juxtaposed properties, aspects, and trends within the phenomenon are the source of motion and development.

Matter does not need a "push" from the outside, for itself is the source of its own development. Just look around you: winds, rains, flowing rivers, growing plants, multiplying animals, sunrise and sunset, day and night, etc.—are all manifestations of matter's eternal motion produced by its own inner forces. Why do trees grow? What makes them grow tall? For this, as we know, a lot of water from the earth must reach every leaf on a tree's top. The force that brings water to the tree top is the force of nature itself. Just as all observable processes are brought about by the interplay of their own forces, so is the motion of all matter effected by its inherent sources.

Scientific philosophy holds that the motion of matter is not just the movement of bodies in space or purely quantitative change. Motion is understood as a process resulting in qualitatively new phenomena. Matter does more than simply move; it develops. The forms of matter's motion did not appear simultaneously: some emerged earlier than others.

The forms of the motion of matter appeared consecutively, one after another. Matter is like an infinite number of "stairs" leading upward and downward. The middle "stairs", those we can see, are the forms of the motion of matter known to modern science. Matter develops from the physical form of motion to its chemical form and further to its biological form.

It is a great merit of Marx, Engels, and Lenin that they saw social life as one of the forms of matter's motion. The social form of the motion of matter is the result of development of all matter, its highest "stair". This position is the basis of the dialectical materialist conception of social life.

As a materialist doctrine, scientific socialism is cardinally different from all other theories. It does not recognise the existence of supernatural forces, and it is based on facts of real life. The theory of scientific socialism frees man of superstitions, stimulates independent and logical thinking, and substantiates the need for a determined struggle to do away with the world of exploitation.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin developed a theory of the role of practice in the evolution of a scientific world outlook. They showed that to ascertain the correctness of particular knowledge man must apply it in productive or social activity. Society's practical activity is the criterion of truth.

These philosophical positions have been borne out by life. Millions of people on all continents have applied the Marxist-Leninist theory of society to effect social revolution and are now building a new society. Thus, life has proved that the theory they have applied is true and can serve as a reliable guide to revolutionary action.

Marxist-Leninist theory itself develops and changes, absorbing ever new knowledge of social life, the knowledge that provides the foundation for peoples' successful revolutionary struggle.

Development of the Science of Society

Long before the theory of scientific socialism came into existence, men strove to understand the essence of social life and the laws governing its development. Teachings of ancient Indian, Chinese and Greek philosophers include various concepts of society. Philosophers of Ancient Greece saw social life as an "imitation of animal life"; according to them men learn everything from animals. This does not explain, however, what makes the life of human society different from the life of animals. Moreover, social development has many aspects that are simply not found in the life of animals (for instance, men create labour implements, buildings, works of art, etc.).

Arab scholars put forth some interesting views. They believed that the lives of people and social changes are determined by the natural environment, by geographical conditions. Thus, nomadic way of life results from availability of pastures, while permanent habitation is determined by availability of fertile lands. Still, many social processes cannot be explained by this theory, notably, why peoples living in similar natural conditions have different levels of development, different social systems, etc.

Later, too, many scholars turned to the natural environment considering it to be the decisive factor of social life. The so-called geopolitics—the doctrine seeking to justify aggression by the geographic position of the country—acquired wide currency in this century. The ideologues of German fascism had sought to justify Germany's "right" to dominate other European nations by its geographic position in the centre of Europe. Philosophers of the pre-Marxian period attempted to establish the regularities of social life through the study of the nature of man. According to them, inasmuch as society consists of individuals and any social activity is the result of people's actions, it is essential to study the individual in order to understand social life. They reasoned more or less as follows. What makes man different from animals? His mind. This was supported by the following reasoning. What causes this or that man to act in a certain way? For example, why does a certain person read a certain book and not another one? The most simple and logical answer to this question is: because this particular person

wants to read this particular book, because this particular book interests this particular person. Hence, inferred the philosophers, the cause of any human action is will, intention, and aspiration. Consequently, the first cause of action is mind. Here a relevant question arises: whose will, intention, or interest can influence social life, social processes in the major way? Is it the will, intention, or aspiration of an ordinary person? Hardly. The man in the street is not his own master. So the thinkers centred their attention on the will, intention, or interest of powerful men: kings, emperors, generals, etc. They sought to find answers to all social questions in the will and thoughts of those powerful men. What ought to be done to change the existing social order? Find a good king, emperor, leader—a ruler who would take people's sufferings to heart and would wish to establish a just social order. That was the reasoning of utopian socialists. The word derives from the Greek *ou topos*—"no place". Utopian socialists—Thomas More (1478-1535), Tomaso Campanella (1568-1639), Gerrard Winstanley (1609-1652), Gracchus Babeuf (1760-1797), Henri Saint-Simon (1760-1825), Charles Fourier (1772-1837), Robert Owen (1771-1858) and others—drew up various projects of a socialist society where every one would be happy, and sent their projects to kings and other influential persons in the hope that they would realise them. No one, however, implemented those projects, and not only because no one wanted to. They could not be implemented because no one, not even a king, can do whatever he wishes in disregard of the obtaining level of society's development.

Today, too, the assertions that history is made by "great men" while ordinary people are no more than agents of their will are widely propagated by bourgeois scholars. Some of them deny the part played by ordinary people in the effort to improve social conditions. Working people are described as a mob that is either dominated by alien will or goes to no end of excesses. Another point of view is that men are not at all able to influence the course of events inasmuch as it is determined by a higher being—the blind fate or the will of god.

These assertions have nothing to do with the real state of socio-political life, they only serve to deceive ordinary people and make it easier to hold them in submission.

Revolution in the Outlook on Society

Marx, Engels, and Lenin gave a scientifically based answer to the questions: What is society? How did society emerge? What determines its development? That effected a revolution in the conception of the evolution of society, which was essentially a replacement of the unscientific, idealistic conception of history with a scientific, materialist conception.

The materialist conception of history was the greatest achievement of Marx: it turned socialism from a utopia into a science. According to the materialist conception of history, not ideas but people's productive activities—changing life conditions and men themselves—are the primary cause of historical events and social changes.

Marx and Engels studied man's inner life, and agreed that man is a thinking being, endowed with reason (conscience). But they did more than just state the fact. They undertook to explain why man is endowed with conscience and how conscience develops.

Man is capable of comprehending the essential properties of an object. This capacity of human mind is called abstract thinking. It is the essence and the specific distinction of human conscience. How did the capacity for abstract thinking arise? Here we come to the question of the origin of man.

Let us compare a man and an animal. An animal feeds itself with things ready-made by nature. Its capacity for orienting itself on visible features of things is enough to find them. As for human beings, to satisfy their vital needs (for food, housing, clothes, etc.), they must transform natural objects to make them meet certain requirements.

That man must work for his livelihood had been known and accepted long before Marx. But he was the first to infer that by changing nature man changes himself.

In the process of labour, man not only creates things, labour implements and other means of subsistence but also improves himself. The development of human labour induced changes in the position of man's head and neck and resulted in his upright posture, as well as a broader horizon, elements of communication (speech), changes in the brain structure, and the development of conscience. Given certain conditions, the features and

capacities acquired by individuals or generations were genetically inherited and fixed in following generations.

Modern science enables us to establish with a great deal of accuracy the duration of this or that stage in man's development. It is noteworthy that the anthropoid men (whose traces have been found in various parts of the Euroasian and African continents had no race divisions, that representatives of different races appeared much later, in the period of formation of the physical type of modern man. The accumulated scientific data disprove the myth that men were created black, white and yellow, as well as other reactionary theories on the origins and causes of races, notably those holding that men of different races developed from different species of apes, and that hence there are insurpassable boundaries between races that are inherent in the human organism. From here comes the conclusion that the presence or absence of certain inherent qualities or capacities in representatives of certain races predetermines their way of life and place in society.

Modern materialist science defines races as groups of people of common origin and biologically inherited secondary features (complexion, eye shape, etc.) that in the course of history appeared in different territories (and in different periods). Secondary biological features have no bearing on man's productive or mental activity. They are a result of ancient men's adjustment to the diversity of geographical environments and conditions of life at the early stages of mankind's evolution. As nature was gradually mastered by man, the influence of geographical environment decreased and new biological distinctions ceased to arise.

Man's essential distinction, therefore, is not racial, ethnical, physical, or biological. As a social being, man is a product of social labour. Man's chief distinction is his capacity to transform reality and produce labour implements and means of subsistence. A significant distinction (mentioned above) is man's ability to think and purposefully interact with other people and objects of the surrounding world.

Production Is the Basis of Social Life

Inasmuch as labour created man and society, it is relevant to understand how men work to comprehend the processes of social life.

Man changes nature using objects he himself makes. The objects used to transform nature are called implements (or tools) of labour. To work, to produce things, one needs not only tools but other things as well (special enclosures, for example). Labour implements and all the other conditions necessary for work are called means of production. The basic aspect of work is the use of tools. Human activity proper started when man began to use tools. Collective work to manufacture things needed by men is called production.

Thus, man and means of production are always linked in the process of production. The means of production, together with the men using them, are called the productive forces of society. The men using the means of production constitute the chief productive force of society. It is obvious that the better and more advanced the means of production, the better the productive forces. Equally important are the abilities of man engaged in production. The labour productivity of a man is determined by his physical strength, work habits, training in his particular field, etc.

As we have already noted, more often than not labour is a collective, or social, type of activity. Thus, working together in the process of production men interact in some way, form certain relationships.

Relations that shape up in the process of production are called production relations.

Production relations are formed on the basis of people's relation to the means of production—whether these means are owned by them collectively or are owned by some of them as private property; whether people work in alliance, assisting each other, or one group strives to employ another group's labour; whether the products of labour are divided on an equal basis or one group appropriates the major portion, giving the others barely enough to sustain their life, etc.

The main aspect of production relations, therefore, is the type of people's relation to the means of production. In a society where the means of production are common property, people help each other in the process of production and equitably distribute the material values they produce. In a society where the means of production are owned by a certain group, all the other relations will be unjust too. To be able to understand the life of

a given society, one must identify the prevailing production relations.

There is a close connection between productive forces and production relations. They are collectively called the mode of production.

Interaction of men and tools is the inner source of constant change and progress in productive forces. As men acquire production experience, knowledge, and labour skills, they improve the existing means of production and create new ones. The latter, in turn, improve work skills and methods of production operations, raising labour productivity and technological efficiency. Productive forces develop in the course of constant improvement of the means of labour and producers of material goods themselves.

Concrete production relations are shaped under the impact of specific productive forces. Productive forces tend to develop faster than production relations, causing contradictions between them. The latter may grow up into a conflict, which signifies the historical necessity of replacing the prevailing obsolete production relations that have become a brake on the development of production. A new form of production communication is shaped in place of the old one, corresponding to the type and level of progressing productive forces.

We may sum up as follows. First, the existence and evolution of human society is induced neither by supernatural forces nor by the will of great individuals but by the emergence and development of man's productive activity. Secondly, productive forces play a determining role in the development of the mode of production. Production relations in their turn have a great effect on the development of productive forces.

Thirdly, the conflict between the upcoming productive forces and the old production relations results in the replacement of one mode of production by another, a new one. That means that the evolution of human society is, in the final count, subject to the operation of the general law of the correspondence of production relations to the type and level of productive forces.

Finally, each particular society, with the mode of production peculiar to it, is a complex social organism with its own structure and organisation.

Social Being and Social Consciousness

The mode of material production and people's activity in the process of production are the basis of society's life. The mode of production is not shaped by the will or interests of men, or by some supernatural force, but through the operation of the laws of nature and the processes of human activity. Let us examine this in detail by first turning to productive forces, means of production in particular. Suppose some people need to build a log house. For this, they will use certain means of production, say, axes. The construction and properties of this tool—which must be harder than wood, sharp, have a specified weight, a handle attached to the iron or stone head, etc.—are determined by the natural properties of the object to be processed (in our case this object is wood).

In other words, the type, construction, or arrangement of the means of production do not depend on man's will. The conditions (processes, laws) relevant to people's life but independent of their will, are called objective conditions.

The other component of productive forces—men—is also shaped by objective conditions.

Now let us examine production relations. When building a log house, men carry out a variety of operations: one group look for suitable trees in a forest, the second group fell them, the third group chop off the branches and trim logs, the fourth group deliver the logs to the construction site, etc. Much depends on who owns the means and products of labour. A group of people are also needed to manage the production process. Within and between these groups, certain types of interaction, certain relationships form. Are these relationships caused or shaped by the will of men? It happens sometimes that a worker refuses to comply with the common rules and discipline. The other participants in the labour process would either try to get rid of him or make him comply with the rules laid by the work collective or the private owner of the means of production. Consequently, the chief condition is not man's will. Indeed, the relations among men are conditioned by the type and nature of work the men are engaged in, that is to say, by objective conditions.

Therefore, the mode of production—both productive forces and corresponding production relations—is determined by

objective conditions, that is, conditions independent of man's will.

The mode of production, as well as a multitude of other objective relationships shaping up in the process of people's activities are collectively called social being.

The life of men has many other aspects to it beside productive activity. Men observe and study the surrounding world, that is, acquire certain knowledge about the world, create works of art, pray, form moral relations (respect for old men, abhorrence of exploiters, etc.). All these—knowledge, sensations, norms of conduct, etc.—shape men's consciousness, and not only the consciousness of individuals or small groups but the consciousness of all members of any particular society. Therefore, it is called social consciousness. It is expressed in various forms: in science, arts, morals, religion.

The content of the forms of social consciousness is largely determined by the relations that shape up in the process of production and consumption of material goods. The totality of society's production relations constitutes its economic structure or basis. The basis exerts a decisive influence both on the development of productive forces and the relations developing outside production. Concepts and ideas, as well as institutions and organisations designed to implement them, are called superstructure.

The character and content of social consciousness are to a great extent determined by the concrete needs and interests of men. It is a matter of man's will whether he studies nature, designs clothes, decorates his house, etc. The main aspects of social consciousness, however, are determined by the basis—the mode of production of material goods, the economic system of a given society. The knowledge a man grasps when studying nature is relevant to a specific labour activity: to orient himself by stars when sailing at night, to grow a plant that bears good fruit. In the final analysis, the mode of production shapes aesthetic outlooks, too. Historically, the things that man himself produces give him a sense of beauty. Man believes in the beauty of the things he creates with his talent, knowledge, skill. They are a pointer to what he is capable of doing, and he admires his own work. The human sense of beauty—which originally relates to what man creates himself—develops and with time extends to various natural objects and phenomena. Labour activity lies at the root

of legal norms and political beliefs, and in certain conditions—of religious creeds and philosophic views.

The Interaction of Being and Consciousness

In the final account, labour activity, and the mode of material production, induce all manifestations of social consciousness. Consciousness, in turn, influences the mode of production. It helps produce means of production: certain manifestations of consciousness (notably moral standards) help maintain discipline at work and improve production relations, that is to say, exert considerable influence on the mode of production.

The mode of production is the core of social being, which embraces the process of people's life itself, their productive activities, observance of various rites, traditions and customs.

Summing up the above, we may emphasise one of the significant conclusions of the theory of scientific socialism—that social being plays a determining role in relation to social consciousness and that the latter, in turn, has an impact on social being.

Although social consciousness (encompassing conscience, will, or desire of powerful people) influences the life of society in some ways, it is shaped largely by the nature of social being, the mode of production in the first place.

The historical evolution of social being, including the mode of production, effects relevant changes in social consciousness and in all aspects of man's life.

The popular masses play a major part in society's evolution. Recognition of the popular masses' decisive role is one of the principal distinctions between Marxism and the idealist theories.

The popular masses are the main productive force of society. The working people are also producers of the main spiritual values. The people carry out all the cardinal changes in the life of society.

The prime mover of society's development, the people, make history not at their will but in conjunction with the objective conditions. Studying social life, Marx arrived at the conclusion that a just, socialist society could not be brought about by the will of some person or persons (as utopian socialists asserted) but would be the result of a purposeful activity by the popular

masses. This is not to say that personality is of no significance in social life: an outstanding person can sooner and better than others grasp the objective tendencies of social progress and organise the masses for their realisation. The ideal of scientific socialism is protection of the rights and freedoms of man, his historical liberation and all-round development. Marxism-Leninism, though, opposes a personality cult, that is, blind worship of a public or historical figure who is ascribed a superhuman ability to make history as he likes. The personality cult is dangerous because it leads to an underestimation of the working masses' history-making role, stifling of people's initiative, and abuses of power.

Marxism-Leninism rejects the personality cult not because it denounces authority as such. A leader possesses authority if he relies on the popular masses; his authority, then, is the manifestation of the people's confidence in him. The role of the popular masses as the makers of history may be traced throughout all principal stages of mankind's evolution.

Chapter Two

PRE-SOCIALIST STAGES OF MANKIND'S EVOLUTION

Modern scientific data indicate that mankind emerged several million years ago.

The study of human history shows that mankind's evolution passed several stages, each with its own level of productive forces, specific production relations, moral standards, and other social institutions comprising the superstructure. Marx termed these stages of society's development "socio-economic formations".

Prior to socialism, four successive stages are known in mankind's history: primitive-communal, slave-owning, feudal, and capitalist. In the contemporary epoch, mankind is changing over to the fifth, communist formation, the first phase of which is socialism.

Due to various reasons, some countries may skip a formation. Notably, some nations escaped the slave-owning stage; others did not go through the capitalist stage and passed right over to socialism.

With all nations, however, the first stage was primitive-communal, as historical research shows.

The Primitive Community

The earliest period of human history is called the primitive-communal system. At that stage people engaged in the simplest labour activities and began to associate in work collectives. At that stage speech developed, and men acquired the capacity for abstract thinking.

The evolution of the primitive community falls into two peri-

ods: the period during which appropriation of natural products prevailed—the economy of appropriation, and the period during which animal husbandry and land cultivation emerged and men began to develop and master methods of increasing the produce of nature by specific human activity—the economy of reproduction.

The Period of Appropriation

In the beginning, men used primitive labour tools. To master nature, they joined hands in work collectives to gather edible plants and hunt. These were small groups of relatives, and their feeding and hunting areas were not very large.

The development of productive activity brought about division of labour in accordance with age and sex. Women collected roots, nuts, and fruits while men went hunting. Old men made tools of labour and passed on their skills to the younger ones.

Man's discovery of fire was of immense importance. We cannot establish with a great degree of accuracy the time this happened. It is only known that fire in its natural condition was widely used some 400-500 thousands years ago. The employment of fire is one of mankind's greatest achievements.

During that period, social life developed rather slowly. Still, people gradually improved production and developed social consciousness; life, on the whole, was becoming better. The means of production were common property, that is, they belonged to all members of a clan or tribe, just as the products went to satisfy the needs of all its members.

The essential features of the primitive community were: joint ownership of the means of production and joint use of inhabited territory; collective low-productivity labour aimed at appropriating natural objects and equitable distribution of the means of subsistence among all members of the community.

Inasmuch as human labour was aimed mostly at appropriating natural objects, men were greatly dependent on nature. With their primitive labour tools they could not make effective use of natural phenomena. Primitive men feared natural forces, they thought that all natural phenomena—the sun, wind, rain, thunder, flood—were caused by some supernatural force, by gods. Thus arose religious consciousness. Each tribe had its own gods and worshipped natural forces in their own fashion.

This kind of religious worship is called heathenism (or paganism). The sense of aesthetic was also directly influenced by social being. In that period, group dancing became fairly well developed. Dancing together, men not only enjoyed their own strength and ability but also developed dexterity and quick reaction, learned to coordinate their actions, and consolidated the primitive community.

Numerous rock drawings of that period have been preserved. Primitive men drew animals mostly in order to know them better, to understand the structure of their bodies and to learn their habits. All that was necessary for successful hunting.

The Period of Reproducing Economy

This is the second long period in the history of the primitive community. Fruit gathering and hunting developed into land cultivation and cattle-breeding. When the latter became man's major occupations, the primitive community entered the period of reproducing economy; in some communes it happened earlier than in others. As dictated by natural conditions, some communes engaged mostly in land cultivation while others took up mainly cattle-breeding.

Land cultivation and cattle-breeding led to further development of communal productive forces. Men developed new methods of making labour implements. Spinning and weaving emerged. Then useful properties of some metals were discovered. Men began to manufacture metal labour implements and weapons; they made decorations, invented the plough and the chariot.

Due to higher labour productivity, the store of food was considerably increased and with it—the numerical strength of the communes. They began to manufacture more means of subsistence than were needed to meet their daily requirements. Thus appeared surplus products, which communes accumulated and used for exchange with others.

As production developed and expanded, there appeared more possibilities for individual members of the commune to redistribute joint products to their own advantage, so private owners emerged. Thus the primitive commune gave birth to private ownership.

Private ownership was also promoted by wars between communes. The victors grew rich by seizing for their own use the biggest share of the war loot, including prisoners who became their slaves.

That period produced a chain of new social phenomena: creation of surplus product as an object of appropriation; exchange on a regular basis; property differentiation; elements of social privilege and oppression, and also elements of the rule of man over man resting on private ownership. All this prepared the downfall of the primitive community and paved the way for inequality and oppression.

Remnants of Primitive-Communal Relations and Their Impact Today

Remnants of communal relations can still be found in some countries. The result of a lengthy period of colonial oppression, they are found in the nations that are yet to make a revolutionary leap in social development.

Studying the primitive community one will draw the following conclusions. First, the emergence and evolution of the primitive community was not the doing of some supernatural powers but had perfectly real and natural causes. The primitive commune is the first stage in the evolution of man found in the history of every nation and, hence, traceable in its material and spiritual culture. Second, the primitive commune or primitive tribal "communism", as it is sometimes called, was a far cry from the Golden Age. The life of the primitive man was extremely hard. To idealise forms of primitive tribal communism in our day is to play into the hands of the champions of colonialism. Third, while rejecting idealisation of communal relations, practical revolutionaries must treat with care certain positive traditions of joint labour activity that have been preserved to our day, for example, the traditions of collective struggle for social emancipation.

Relations of cooperation and mutual aid domineered in primitive communes for a commune was a production group and a collective owner. Today, it is possible to purposefully influence the process of the disintegration of tribal and communal relations in a nation that has opted for socialism.

Countries that have freed themselves from colonial domina-

tion may study the experience of the Soviet Union in their effort to overcome the historical backwardness of some regions, in particular those which still had communal relations at the time of the socialist revolution. The experience of the Soviet Union shows that in a society of social justice it is possible to transform tribal relations through the development of collective ownership.

The Slave-Owning Socio-Economic Formation

Further development of productive forces promoted the spread and consolidation of private ownership.

The Rise of Transitional Societies

Let us note some of the most important events in the history of the primitive community, the events which resulted in the rise of transitional societies and later, in the formation of the slave-owning socio-economic system. Farmers and cattle-breeders exchanged products and trade expanded. That called for improvements in the means of production. Hence there emerged groups of people engaged solely in the making of the means and implements of labour necessary for manufacturing products. Those men were called artisans. Artisans sold their produce. The need to sell their produce distracted the farmers and cattle-breeders from their respective occupations, so they engaged others to sell their produce. There appeared groups of people-merchants—whose sole occupation was the sale and purchase of goods. Merchants and artisans lived in settlements, separately from farmers and cattle-breeders. Those settlements later grew into towns.

The higher productivity of labour and life in settlements created favourable living conditions. As a result, they began to eat better food, became healthier, and lived longer, all of which increased the rates of population growth.

The development of productive forces and the spread and consolidation of private ownership brought about transitional societies combining elements of communal and private economy. Those societies began to exploit the labour of bonded people (slaves), although that did not have an all-embracing character. The first transitional societies appeared in the East. The

earliest were Sumer, Accad, and Babylonia. They appeared in the East because of the favourable climate and soil there, as well as the presence of easily cultivated and domesticated plants and animals. Numerous tribes lived in that region. The exchange of labour experience and fast rise of culture promoted communication among them. Later there appeared the Ancient Egyptian society in the valley of the Nile, the Harappa society in the valley of the Indus, and the Chinese society in the valley of the Hwang Ho.

Some of those societies existed for several hundred years before they disappeared, due to various reasons: some because they were conquered by foreign tribes, others as a result of inner strife or inability to produce new means of production suitable to the changed natural environment.

Formation of Classes. The Emergence of the State

The main characteristic of the society that succeeded the primitive commune was the development of private ownership and emergence of differences in the property status.

Some men—mostly prisoners of war and impoverished members of some communes—fell into bondage and became slaves. The development of the primitive community, as we can see, brought about substantial differences in the status of people.

Gradually, there emerged and developed specific groups of private property owners—the ruling class of society. The rest of society comprised the oppressed class. Society was thus divided into two opposite classes—the exploiters and the exploited. The emergence of private property and forced labour, it must be pointed out, raised labour productivity. Its sole beneficiaries, however, were the minority, i.e., private owners, while the life and labour of the working people did not improve.

The exploitation experienced by the working people, on the one hand, and on the other, their anger and discontent, gave rise to various forms of socio-class protest.

In the primitive society, there had gradually emerged a special group of people—tribal chiefs, seniors, village elders—who managed the tribe's affairs. As society developed and as social requirements grew, this group gradually moved to the top of society. The leaders looked upon the tribe's activities to satisfy

collective requirements as their personal merit, seeing themselves as "benefactors".

They built up authority and sought to prove that they were distinguished, God-chosen people. They appropriated the products of society's labour and used them to obtain better housing, clothes, food, etc. They made others work for them, used the services of numerous servants.

To hold the exploited in submission and make them work, the exploiters created a special organisation called the state. The state emerged as social inequality appeared. It came to be the propertied minority's instrument for oppressing the poor majority.

The state is a system of agencies of power and coercion—the army, police, judiciary. The state issues laws to be complied with by everyone in society. The laws define the duties of the oppressed.

The state extends its authority to all people living within a certain territory. Any state, including the exploiter state, organises society's labour and maintains a certain order in social life. Should the need arise, the state organises the defence of its territory against the enemy. Any state fulfils both internal and external functions. In other words, its activities are aimed at maintaining the supremacy of one class over other classes as well as at building relations with other nations, other states.

Every state has its own particular form of government which is characterised by a particular organisation of state authority, bodies of power and the persons representing them. In the early period of mankind's evolution there already existed two basic forms of government; the monarchy and the republic.

The monarchy is undivided rule by a single person—the monarch. Under the republican form of rule, state authority is vested in elected representatives. In the slave-owning society, representatives of state authority were elected solely from among the class of exploiters—the slave-owners.

The early republic had two forms—aristocratic and democratic. The former is government by a small group of people elected from among the most rich and influential exploiters. In the democratic republic, power is vested in a broader section of society. Slaves, however, were not treated as human beings, and there-

fore power was exercised only by representatives of the exploiting classes.

As the class state advanced it was characterised by new forms of state administration. Methods of coercion gradually became more sophisticated and more people were engaged in governing the state.

Evolution of Slave-Owning

Exploitation of man by man, as noted in preceding sections, originated in the earliest communities. Forms of oppression were particularly brutal in Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome. The exploited were called slaves and the exploiters—slave-owners. That kind of bondage is called slavery, and the social system in which slaves create the bulk of all material values is called the slave-owning system or the slave-owning socio-economic formation.

The slave-owning society was the first exploiter socio-economic formation; it was followed by other exploiter socio-economic formations—feudal and capitalist. The slave-owning formation is distinguished by the use of primitive tools of labour. At first wooden and stone labour tools prevailed; later metal tools appeared—bronze and iron (later). The plough, harrow, spade, sickle, and pitchfork were used in agriculture. As the slave-owning society advanced, there emerged large workshops and mines where more slaves were exploited.

Impressive monuments of slave labour have been preserved to our day: Egyptian pyramids; Roman theatres, canals, and waterpipes; Greek and Indian temples and palaces, etc. Irrigation facilities were set up in river valleys with hand-dug canals.

For the slave-owner to make slaves work for him there had to be certain production relations, distinguished by the slave-owner's complete ownership of slaves and all that they produced. In the eyes of the slave-owner, a slave was not a human being: he was treated as an object and could be bought, sold, killed, etc.

The slave-owning state protected the interests of the slave-owners, helped them exploit slaves and put them to coercive labour. The state crushed slave uprisings employing armed detachments. Coercion in relation to slaves and suppression of their revolts were the principal internal policy function of a slave-

owning state. Its principal external function was to conduct wars for the purpose of taking prisoners to make slaves of them.

The exploiter society in general, and the slave-owning one in particular, employs various methods in order to preserve the rule of the exploiting class: it conducts definite policies of one class or classes toward another class or classes. The state develops and circulates various theories and concepts designed to convince the working people of the "just nature" of the existing social order. Thus, slaves in a slave-owning state were made believe that they were slaves by nature and hence their sole mission was to toil for masters who were so ordained by nature. The chief purpose of such theories was to keep slaves in subjugation.

Hard physical labour and brutality with which revolts were put down invoked in the slaves the feeling of despair. Hence their hopes for the help of some almighty, supernatural, miraculous force. They believed that this force—god—knew of the injustice of their plight, and one day was going to help all the suffering and downtrodden. So originated religions which continue to be widespread among many peoples today. There are three fundamental religions: Buddhism (which emerged in the 6th-5th centuries B. C.), Christianity (the 1st century) and Islam (the 7th century). The development of all religions can to a considerable extent, be attributed to downtrodden working people's aspirations for a better life.

For a long time, the ruling classes persecuted and harassed believers. With time, however, they learned to make use of the working people's religious beliefs in order to enslave them spiritually. The ruling classes interpreted religious concepts to serve their own interests; they sought to prove that god had purposefully divided people into the rich and the poor, masters and slaves, and would punish those who disobeyed their masters. Concepts of that sort were vigorously encouraged by churchmen, servants of the exploiters. The church fully extended its support to the ruling classes. That led to the alliance of the church and the state. As society develops, the ruling classes exploit religion on an ever wider scale to promote their selfish interests.

In its most graphic form, slavery existed in the 5th-2nd centuries B.C. in Ancient Greece and later in the Roman Empire. When the slave-owning system disintegrated, various forms of slavery persisted in some European states up until the 13th

century; in some Italian cities (Venice, Genoa) slave trade continued until the 16th century.

Forms of slavery were different in the Middle East, India, China and Central Europe. The slave would sell himself to the slave-owner for a certain period (a year or two), while he preserved his ownership of a plot of land and some means of production. Unlike the Ancient Greek slave, he had a family, and his own children would not necessarily become slaves. Slaves made of prisoners of war often worked together with free people, albeit for less food. Many of them could later become free men. Slavery in the Middle East existed until the 10th-11th centuries.

The same form of slavery was known in Ancient Rus. There, slaves were mostly used as servants, and this type of slavery existed until the 9th-10th centuries.

The African and American peoples had practically not known slavery in the precolonial period. Harsh forms of slavery were introduced there by European colonisers in the 16th century. Since then, slave trade became widespread, in particular the transplantation of African slaves to the American continent. Millions of slaves were shipped in the 18th-19th centuries, at the dawn of capitalism, from Africa to America. Capitalists used slaves as a free labour force. It was only in 1956 that, on the demand of the socialist states, the United Nations Organisation approved a convention on the universal prohibition of slave trade and the use of slave labour. In some capitalist countries, however, there are still cases of both slave trade and the use of bonded labour.

Disintegration of the Slave-Owning System

The history of slave-owning society is the history of continuous slave revolts and mass actions against the slave-owners. The biggest revolt of slaves against exploiters took place in Ancient Rome, under the leadership of Spartacus (73-71 B. C.).

Slave revolts show that with the emergence of classes, the struggle between the exploited and exploiters became the driving force of social development.

Although all slave uprisings were suppressed (the Spartacus-

led revolt, in particular, was put down with unexemplified ferocity), the struggle waged by the slaves undermined the foundations of the slave-owning system. Slave-owning relations were increasingly coming into contradiction with society's developing productive forces.

As society developed, means of production improved, albeit very slowly. Tools of labour became more sophisticated; various new mechanisms, draught animals, water-mills, etc., came into use. Labour productivity increased and, subsequently, the profits of the exploiter class. The slave form of exploitation, though, did not make it possible to utilise in full the potential of productive forces, since slaves were not interested in the results of their own labour. The exploiters began to give them small plots of land and some means of production, with the aim of getting them interested in the progress of production. A new economic system thus took shape in the 3rd and early 4th centuries—the feudal socio-economic system.

The Feudal Formation

Evolution of Feudalism

This socio-economic formation evolved in different ways. In the territories of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome, i.e. in those regions where slavery existed in its most pronounced forms, the new, feudal, relations emerged from the system whereby the slave owned a plot of land and a small portion of what he produced. The formation of feudal relations was given a strong impetus when Roman territories were seized by the peoples who had come from the north of Europe, those in whose development slavery had ceased to play any significant part by that time.

The first feudal states emerged on the territory of the present-day Italy and in the south of France.

Feudal relations gradually emerged in their particular forms in India, China, and the Middle East.

Though peoples entered feudalism in different ways, the process was essentially the same everywhere: there emerged a class of feudal lords (from *feud*—a land plot) and a class of dependent and exploited peasants maintaining their small-

scale holdings on a fixed plot of land owned by the feudal lord, to whom they gave part of their produce.

Distinctions of the Feudal Mode of Production

The feudal socio-economic formation is distinguished by a higher level of productive forces, compared with the slave-owning system.

Under feudalism, agriculture has a primary significance for the economy. The iron plough and other metal agricultural implements raised the level of agricultural production. Vegetable-growing and other branches of agriculture, including livestock raising—horse-breeding in particular—were boosted.

Better agricultural implements and methods of metal smelting and processing encouraged the development of crafts which, in turn, boosted the growth of feudal towns.

As feudalism strengthened, new production relations took shape and facilitated a more efficient utilisation of productive forces and their further development.

Society was still split into two opposing classes: the exploiters and the exploited. The relations between them, however, began to acquire a new form. The master gave the working man (his serf) a plot of land. The serf owned some means of production and hence could, it would seem, work for himself. Still, he was in personal bondage to his master (the landlord or feudal lord). Serfs remained so from generation to generation. A landlord owned a certain estate, and all the peasants living within it were his serfs. Landlords could sell, barter, or give away their land or serfs. The serfs had no right to leave the landlord.

Feudal exploitation manifested itself in three basic forms. The earliest form was corvée. Using mostly his own means of labour, the peasant serf worked on his master's land for five or six days each week. The remaining one or two days of the week he worked on his own plot of land. The second form was rent in kind, the system whereby the peasant was allotted a plot of land to cultivate and, in turn, gave the landlord the bulk of the produce, leaving but an insignificant portion for his own use. The third form was money rent, which became widespread at the higher stages of feudalism. The peasant sold his produce and gave his landlord the bigger portion of the proceeds.

Production relations of this type encouraged the peasant's interest in the results of his labour and thus stimulated his labour activity.

Although at the initial stage of European feudalism means of production were less sophisticated than in the slave-owning formation, feudal production was, on the whole, at a higher level and labour in general was more productive.

Feudal society's significant feature is predomination of subsistence economy, under which production was meant for internal consumption rather than for exchange with other producers. The needs of the feudal lord and his family and numerous servants were satisfied either with products from the feudal estate or those delivered by peasant serfs. There were artisans in every feudal estate, too. A small number of vital products (salt, for example), some metalwares, and luxury goods were supplied by merchants from towns or from foreign countries.

The peasant economy was subsistence economy. Peasants were engaged not only in agriculture but also in processing their produce, spinning, weaving, manufacture of footwear, household utensils, and labour implements, etc.

Feudal lords subjected their serfs to severe exploitation. The landlord's appropriation of the peasant's fruits of labour was the essence of feudal exploitation. The landlord would often take from his peasant not only what was produced over and above the subsistence level of the peasant and his family, but also a major part of the produce needed to sustain normal exsistence.

Characteristic Features of Feudalism's Development

Feudal society may be graphically depicted as a hierarchical ladder with two major ruling feudal groups on the upper rungs and peasants and artisans on the lower. One ruling group was the feudal lords proper, usually with the monarch at the head; the other, in the majority of nations, was comprised by the higher clergy. The two numerically small social groups owned the bulk of society's wealth. They held the feudal state in their own hands. For a long period of time they played the leading role in society's spiritual life.

The remaining strata of society were embraced in the so-called third estate and had rigorously limited social rights. Their

de facto inequality was legalised. The principal classes of feudal society were secular and church feudals (the exploiters) and the class of peasantry and artisans (the exploited).

In feudal society, the state's internal function was essentially that of preserving serfdom. The state issued laws stipulating the power of the landlords; it caught and punished fugitive peasants, its armed detachments suppressed serf uprisings. The feudal state's external function consisted in seizures of new lands and acquisition of new serfs. The army was made up of serfs only; the term of service was lengthy (15 to 20 years) and was essentially a form of punishment.

The feudal state's form of government was monarchy. In the period of feudalism there existed many small states—each ruled by a monarch—constantly at war with one another.

Under feudalism, the role of the church was particularly great. It protected the interests of the monarch and landowners as well as its own, since it was a major landowner. The church declared monarchs and landlords God's emissaries on Earth and sanctioned their arbitrary rule over the serfs.

The domination of religion in society's cultural life considerably slowed down the cultural progress of European nations. The great achievements made in Ancient Greece and Rome in the field of philosophy, sciences, architecture, sculpture and literature were either sentenced to oblivion or, as in the case of literature and philosophy, tailored to religious dogmas.

In the Middle East, India and China the evolution of feudalism unfolded in a different way. The ancient societies that had once existed in those regions had disintegrated before the emergence of the Ancient Greek and Roman civilisations. The new states that arose on their ruins were based on the patriarchal form of slave-owning and were largely marked by relations of feudal character. That stemmed from the level of productive forces in those regions. Most of the states were situated in the valleys of big rivers which, due to regular overflows, had covered enormous areas with fertile silt. Numerous irrigation facilities were set up on that rich soil. The maintenance of irrigation facilities and cultivation of land were carried out by small groups of families, communes. The commune members and the land they cultivated belonged to an elder. Above several such elders stood another elder, of a higher rank. They all served the state headed by

a despot, owner of the entire land and all irrigation facilities. The bulk of the produce was consumed by the upper ruling circles. The commune was a peculiar and confined community with a rigorous internal division of labour —which in India gave rise to society's division into castes. The ruling classes and the clergy supported the caste division since it undermined the working people's unity and hence weakened their struggle against the exploiters.

That economic system proved very stable and existed several thousand years. Productive forces in those countries developed steadily, albeit slowly. At the time when in Europe the slave-owning system was disintegrating and feudalism was emerging, Asian states were witnessing similar processes. Elements of slavery were gradually fading away while feudal relations were becoming stronger. The productive forces—means of production and the working people with their labour skills—were continuously improving.

The Struggle Against Feudalism. Remnants of Feudalism Today

The history of feudal society is marked by mass peasant wars and revolts: the 874-901 peasant war in China, the peasant rising of 1438-1439 in Transilvania (partly on the territory of modern Hungary), the 1524-1526 peasant war in Germany, the 1628-1645 peasant war in China, the 1653 peasant war in Switzerland, and numerous peasant wars of the 17th and 18th centuries in Russia.

Uprisings were caused by the peasants' plight and brutal exploitation. The uprisings demolished the foundations of feudal relations, and were essentially attempts to find a way out of the contradictions of social life in feudal society. The long period of the development of social production and class struggle culminated in feudal society's giving way to capitalist society.

Traces of feudalism, it should be noted, still exist in many countries today. They are particularly widespread in the economically weak countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Remnants of feudal relations hinder the progress of developing countries, their national revival and economic independence. Therefore, knowledge of the evolution and essence of feudalism is of vital importance for revolutionaries today.

The Capitalist Formation

Emergence of Capitalism

New economic relations gradually emerged within feudal society. They were brought about by the advance of agricultural production and crafts, the growth of cities and the extension of economic ties between town and village as well as among countries.

The expansion of handicraft production demanded increasing numbers of workers. Working people began to migrate from the countryside to towns. The handicraft shop—the simplest form of cooperation—emerged. Individual shops later merged into enterprises, the so-called manufactories, employing hundreds of men each; these men who came to be called proletarians, or industrial workers. The proletarian is a qualitatively new type of working man. The bulk of what he produces is appropriated by the owner of the means of production—the capitalist. Hence the class of capitalists which is antagonistic to the working class. The new socio-economic system, born within the feudal system, is called capitalism.

With time manufactories became large-scale industrial enterprises which required increasing numbers of workers. Peasants also worked at manufactories. What they earned went to pay money rent to their landlords. Some peasants were also sent to town to work for a specified period.

Growing rapidly rich, capitalists sponsored sea expeditions. In the 15th century, European seafarers sailed to Africa and India, and also discovered a new continent—America. The great geographical discoveries stimulated the development of capitalism in Europe. The newly obtained lands provided cheap raw materials as well as cheap labour force and were, at the same time, an enormous and highly profitable market. Colonisation—the exploitation of whole continents—dates back to that time. Capitalist relations began to form within the feudal economies of Asian countries, too, although the process was extremely slow. Europeans who arrived in those regions found a predomination of feudal relations, which were at a very low level in some places. The peoples inhabiting those regions could not withstand the onslaught of European capitalists and fell into colonial dependence. To a considerable extent this was

due to the fact that local exploiters sided with the newcomers.

Social Revolution

The capitalist economy of European countries was growing stronger, its productive forces improved. The manufactory production was based on a minute division of labour, each worker fulfilling one definite operation with the means of labour—instruments—well suited for this specific purpose. That substantially raised labour productivity. A significant rise in labour productivity was brought about by the invention and spread of various machines. The division of labour, machine technology, and ever new means of production demanded the advance of man as a productive force. The worker had to master new instruments, fulfil labour operations quickly and dexterously, know well the machines he operated, and possess a certain basic scientific knowledge. The capitalist economy, therefore, created new productive forces, which were much better than those of the feudal system.

The new forces of production required the development of appropriate relations of production; to sell the capitalist his labour power, the working man had to be free from personal bondage. Traces of feudalism—the working man's personal dependence on his landlord—were in the way of the new production relations.

Thus originated the contradiction between the new—capitalist—productive forces and the old—feudal—relations of production. That contradiction worsened the life and work conditions of the peasants more than anything else. On the one hand, the serf knew that he could leave for a capitalist enterprise and somehow better his life. On the other, his landlord would pursue, return, and punish him by exploiting him even more cruelly or by selling him to the army. That aroused mass unrest among the peasants. Most of the peasant wars and insurrections took place in the 16th and 17th centuries, the period when capitalist relationships were formed within feudal societies.

Thus the prerequisites for social revolution emerged: the exploiters, the exploiter state could no longer rule the oppressed using the means and methods that had until then been employed; the working people's situation was worsening, their exploitation

was increasing, and the working masses were beginning to openly display their unwillingness to live in the old way and desire to change the existing state of affairs.

Such a situation, as has been already pointed out, emerged with the disintegration of the slave-owning system. A similar situation, as we shall see, shaped up in contemporary capitalist society.

A revolutionary situation is resolved by a social revolution, which is a cardinal change of a socio-political system. A social revolution is carried out in the course of the struggle waged by the exploited and downtrodden and is essentially the overthrow of the exploiting classes and suppression of their resistance. The historical experience of many peoples and countries shows that a social revolution is, more often than not, carried out through an armed uprising. Given favourable conditions, though, it may also be effected in a peaceful way.

A social revolution is the highest stage of class struggle. The working people destroy old production relations in their struggle against hated exploiters.

A social revolution should not be mistaken for a military coup; the latter is, as a rule, the result of the struggle for power waged by various groups within one and the same ruling class. A military coup may start a social revolution only if it is staged by representatives of oppressed classes.

When in the course of a revolution the working people abolish the domination of some exploiting class, a very important question arises: who will own the means of production? This is followed by another: who will take over state power?

The transfer of state power from the hands of one class to the hands of another is the principal and basic indication of any social revolution.

We have seen that a revolutionary situation took shape with the origination of capitalism within the feudal system. The working people, primarily peasants and industrial workers, exploited by capitalists, launched a revolutionary struggle against the feudal lords and hence against feudal relations. The nascent class of capitalists, the bourgeoisie, also discontent with feudal relationships, joined the working people and in some of the revolutions even headed their struggle. The bourgeoisie proclaimed slogans appealing to the working people: "freedom", "equality", "fraternity".

Inasmuch as those revolutions were headed by the bourgeoisie, they were called bourgeois revolutions. Since it led the revolutions, the bourgeois class benefited more than any other class from their results. It assumed state power, took hold of all material values, first of all the means of production, and hence became the new ruling class. In some cases it came to terms with feudal lords and monarchs, with which it then shared state power.

A social revolution produces new relations of production and hence initiates a new socio-economic formation.

The 17th-century English Revolution was one of the first bourgeois revolutions. The 18th century witnessed the French Bourgeois Revolution that had an enormous impact on many countries, bringing about social changes in Europe and far beyond it. The German bourgeois revolution took place in the middle of the 19th century.

By the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the capitalist formation had, in the main, taken shape in Europe.

What Is Capitalist Society?

The new socio-economic formation had far greater developed productive forces. Industry was increasingly using various machinery: the steam machine, electric motor, turbine, internal-combustion engine, etc. Man as a productive force developed along with the development of the means of production; his qualification and technical knowledge improved; higher demands were placed on the quality and organisation of labour.

The creation of various machinery required that the laws of nature be conceived studied and utilised. This promoted scientific research, the results of which were widely applied in capitalist production. Capitalist enterprises employed child and female labour, which was cheaper than male labour. Today, too, quite a few capitalist enterprises employ child labour.

Capitalist production relations correspond to highly developed productive forces. A capitalist is the sole owner of the means of production.

At first glance, the capitalist and the worker might be considered commodity owners enjoying equal rights: the capitalist is the owner of the means of production while the worker

owns his labour power. No one, apparently, can compel the worker to seek employment with this or that particular capitalist. The capitalist pays the worker for his labour on the time or quantity basis. The worker, it would seem, is paid in full and hence is not in any way exploited by the capitalist. It means only one thing, though—that the capitalist exploitation is of a covert nature.

Actually, what the worker sells to the capitalist is not his labour but his labour power, i.e., the totality of his physical and mental capacities realised in the process of production. Labour power as labour capability exists in every society. However, it is only under definite conditions that it may be turned into a commodity. The conditions are: (1) the producer must have personal freedom, making it possible for him to act as a seller of (his) labour power in the market and enter into a deal with the buyer—owner of means of production; (2) a seller of labour power must be deprived of the means of production and subsistence, otherwise he would be in no need to sell his labour power.

These conditions developed as the feudal system disintegrated and the capitalist mode of production was established. The conversion of labour power into a commodity is a distinguishing feature of capitalism.

Having sold his labour power, the proletarian begins to work at a capitalist enterprise, where the bulk of all society's wealth is produced. That wealth is appropriated by the capitalist. Marx shed light on the secret of capitalist exploitation in his great work *Capital*.

Marx shows that at a capitalist enterprise the working day and labour of every worker fall into two parts. The value of what the worker produces during the first part of the working day equals the value of his labour power. Let us assume that the first part of the working day is 4 hours long. The labour expended during that time is called necessary labour. However, the capitalist makes the worker put in not four but about ten hours of work and appropriates, without compensation, what the worker produces during the additional 6 hours—the surplus value. Therefore, the commodities produced at a capitalist enterprise absorb, in addition to the necessary (paid) labour, a certaian amount of unpaid labour, which the worker is compelled to give the capitalist under the threat of dismissal.

The above is the essence of capitalist exploitation. If the working day is no longer than the time necessary to cover the expenditure on the needs of the worker and his family, the capitalist would not start the business in the first place because he would not expect to make any profit.

The labour which is in excess of that needed for the upkeep of the worker and his family is called surplus labour; the period of time during which the surplus labour is expended is called surplus labour time. In any exploiter society there would inevitably exist necessary labour and surplus labour; the latter is appropriated by the exploiting class without compensation. It was true of the slave-owning system (slave-owners appropriated the bulk of what slaves produced) and of the feudal system, under which landowners appropriated the results of peasants' labour. A similar situation obtains under capitalism. The (unpaid) surplus labour of workers provides a source of profit for the capitalist.

As capitalism develops, the exploitation of workers intensifies. Whereas in the early 19th century the worker had to work for the capitalist during approximately half of his working day, in modern industrialised countries, work for the capitalist consumes at least two-thirds of the worker's labour time.

The degree of exploitation is even higher in many Asian, African and Latin American countries. For instance, at many mining enterprises in South Africa, Black miners have to give their employers over nine-tenths of their labour time.

In the first quarter of the 19th century, capitalism took a firm hold in the majority of European countries. By that time, there had already emerged the classes and other social groups typical of the capitalist socio-economic formation; the capitalist class structure had taken shape. The main classes are those whose existence is directly linked with the predominant relations of production—the capitalists (the bourgeoisie) and the working class.

The working class in capitalist society is the class of wage workers, deprived of the means of production and earning their livelihood by selling their labour power; they produce the bulk of all material values and are subjected to capitalist exploitation.

The bourgeoisie constitutes the ruling class of capitalist society; it owns the means of production and lives by exploiting wage labour.

Using a variety of methods, the bourgeoisie also exploits the toiling peasants and representatives of other social strata.

The bourgeoisie of contemporary capitalist society is not a uniform class.

There are also non-basic classes. Thus, there still exist remnants of feudal economies and numerically weak classes of landowners and peasants. In some countries, those classes play a fairly significant role.

This is especially true of peasants. Today peasants comprise over half of the entire population of the capitalist world. Their percentage is the highest among the populations of African and Asian countries. Socio-economic progress leads to stratification within the class of peasants. A small number of rich peasants emerge, some of whom later become agricultural capitalists. At the same time, a large number of peasant holdings are ruined. Some of the landless peasants hire themselves out; others leave to settle in cities.

The urban middle strata, with a status between the workers and the bourgeoisie, hold an important place in the structure of capitalist society. This section is comprised mainly by the petty urban bourgeoisie, owning means of production, employing a few wage workers, and as a rule directly participating in the production of material values.

An important place is occupied by the social strata of office employees, who are engaged in non-physical labour of the managerial type.

The strata of intelligentsia is also very important. They are professionals who engage in mental and creative work, advancing and spreading culture.

Having revealed the essence of capitalist exploitation, Marx pointed out the chief purpose of production under capitalism: the acquisition of surplus value and enrichment of capitalists. This purpose is achieved through brutal exploitation of industrial workers and other groups of working people.

By subordinating everything to the acquisition of personal wealth, capitalists greatly harm the interests of society, thus exacerbating capitalist contradictions.

As capitalism advances, ever new branches of industry and agriculture emerge and their interconnections grow stronger. Major factories with greater numbers of workers labouring un-

der capitalists replace old fragmented economic units. These factories, too, have a certain level of division of labour. Hundreds and thousands of workers, therefore, take part in the manufacture of every commodity.

The process of production acquires an increasingly social character, though the means of production and the products remain in private hands. The purpose of the capitalist production is enrichment of capitalists.

In their drive for surplus value, in which they are encouraged by the lust for wealth and by competition, capitalists continue to expand production and increase exploitation. As a result, the situation of the working masses worsens.

A paradoxical situation arises. A great amount of goods are produced and a great number of people are in need of these goods—but they cannot acquire them. The normal process of production and consumption is hindered by the fact that economic progress is subordinated to the profit-making of capitalists. The capitalist economy has been regularly shattered by crises since 1825.

The crises are accompanied by mass unemployment, deteriorating conditions of broad sections of the population, bankruptcies of small-scale and average businesses. Economic crises hit not only the working people of developed capitalist countries but also some developing nations.

Eventually, the development of capital leads capitalism to disaster. The capitalist socialisation of production and labour means that in the heart of the moribund economic system there have developed the material prerequisites for the transition to socialism. The productive forces created by capitalism have ceased to fit in the framework of capitalist production relations. Inconsistencies increase, making the replacement of capitalist production relations with socialist relations of production objectively necessary.

Simultaneously, there mature subjective prerequisites of transition to socialism. Developing production, capitalism unites workers in joint labour.

Class Struggle Under Capitalism

Class struggle has been taking place throughout the entire history of class society. Under capitalism, class struggle is

at a significantly higher level than under the slave-owning or feudal system. It is so because the working class differs substantially from the exploited classes of the two preceding socio-economic formations. First, it is stronger numerically, comprising, in fact, the major percentage of a capitalist country's population. Secondly, major contingents of the working class, primarily industrial workers, are concentrated at urban enterprises. This facilitates their organisation for joint action. Thirdly, the working class has a higher level of political consciousness than the preceding oppressed classes.

The proletariat's level of consciousness and organisation makes it the most revolutionary class. Therefore, the proletariat becomes the chief motive force and leader of a socialist revolution. Carrying out a socialist revolution, the proletariat emancipates, not only itself, but also all the working people, the entire society.

To be able to mount successful attack at the capitalist system, the proletariat must be quite aware of its immediate and ultimate goals, that is, it should be abreast with the theory of scientific socialism.

Was there any force capable of linking the working movement with the science of socialism and organising, on that basis, the struggle of broad proletarian masses and other working people? One or several individuals, as outstanding and courageous as they may be, would have never been able to cope with this objective. It could be reached only by a party embracing the advanced forces of society, the vanguard of the working class, i.e. the party comprising the most staunch and politically conscious revolutionaries loyal to the cause of socialism.

Marx and Engels, and later Lenin, paid considerable attention to the creation and expansion of the organisation of revolutionaries, to the advancement of the communist movement. Following the suggestion of Marx and Engels, the first international proletarian party, formed in 1847, was called a communist organisation. It was the Communist League, an organisation which set itself the goal of mobilising the working class and all the exploited people for the struggle to abolish the capitalist system and build a communist society. Marx and Engels wrote the programme of that organisation—the Mani-

festo of the Communist Party. According to Marx and Engels, a communist party is distinct from other proletarian parties. First, because in the struggle of the proletarians of different nations it identifies and defends the general interests of the proletariat, irrespective of the national character. These interests coincide with the cardinal interests of all the exploited people. Second, the communist party combines the struggle for immediate goals and interests of the working class and all working people with the struggle for a radical transformation of society, i.e. for socialism. Also, it develops its policies proceeding from the concrete analysis of a concrete situation; supports any and all revolutionary movements against the exploiter society and strives for an alliance and accord among democratic parties in all countries.

The Communist League played a major role in the period of the 1848-49 revolutions in a number of European countries. It helped the working class develop awareness of its class interests and taught it to work out its own tactics in the fight against the bourgeoisie. The Communist League ceased to exist in 1852, after the court trial of its members.

As capitalism asserted itself in a number of countries, the rise of the revolutionary movement demanded a new organisation of workers. The International Working Men's Association, set up in 1864 with Marx's active participation, has gone down in the history of the working-class movement as the First International. In its documents Marx formulated the proletarian movement's basic programmatic proposition: the working class must effect its own emancipation; to attain this goal, the economic and political efforts of workers in all countries must be combined. Marx emphasised that the workers' numerical strength is not enough, that the workers' struggle cannot be successful unless the working masses are organised and armed with knowledge.

The historic significance of the First International lies in the fact that it rallied fragmented revolutionary contingents, worked out the theoretical and organisational foundations of the international working-class movement, and defined the role of the party and trade unions in the struggle of the working class. It also formulated the working class's attitude toward peasants, national liberation movements, and war. Thus, it laid

the foundation of the international proletarian struggle for socialism.

The ideas of the First International found reflection in the activities of the Paris Commune.

The Paris Commune, the first working-class government, existed from March 18 to May 28, 1871. It was a bloc of revolutionaries comprised of the working class and other strata of the bourgeois society.

The Paris Commune commenced the abolition of the old bourgeois state apparatus and the creation of a new type of government—the first ever dictatorship of the proletariat. During the several weeks of its existence, the Paris Commune adopted a number of measures to improve the material well-being of the broad masses.

The bourgeoisie of France and other countries joined efforts to suppress the rising of the Communards, who, in Marx's expression, were "storming heaven". The Commune's defeat was brought about, among other things, by the errors of its leaders, notably by their underestimation of the need for an alliance between the working class and peasants, their unwillingness to wage a firm and resolute struggle against the bourgeoisie, etc.

Drawing on the experience of the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels arrived at a number of conclusions important for the working-class movement, first of all that to effect a victorious proletarian revolution it is necessary to establish the political domination of the working class in alliance with other exploited masses, destroy the old bourgeois government machinery and create a truly democratic state of the working people, and that the new power must defend the revolution against the desperate attempts of the overthrown classes to reinstate the old order.

They drew a number of other relevant conclusions as well. One of the most important among them was the conclusion that the working class needs its own national revolutionary party. The First International was an international organisation; it fulfilled its historical objective of developing Marxism and laying the foundations for the development of workers' parties in European and American countries.

Imperialism: the Eve of Socialist Revolution

What is imperialism? Is there any difference between the terms "capitalism" and "imperialism"?

Lenin gives us answers to these questions. He created the scientific theory of imperialism, which he exposed in his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, which is a direct continuation of Marx's *Capital*.

Lenin's chief conclusion is that imperialism is capitalism at the highest and last stage of its development. At this stage capitalism acquires a number of features which render it cardinally distinct from the previous stage. However, at the new stage capitalism retains its foundations: capitalist ownership, exploitation of wage labour and the profound contradictions associated with it. These contradictions become even more profound and acute.

Monopoly domination is the most characteristic feature of imperialism. A monopoly is an association of big capitalists controlling the production and distribution of a substantial portion of the output of one or several industries for the purpose of obtaining huge profits.

The forms of monopoly include: the cartel—a combination of enterprises that are bound by agreements regulating the quantity of output, allocating markets, fixing terms of hire, etc., for the purpose of extracting maximal profits; the syndicate—a group of enterprises maintaining joint offices for sales transactions while each of them retains its production independence; the trust—a group of businesses devoid not only of commercial but also of productive independence. Its more sophisticated form is the concern, amalgamating trusts in many industries.

Production is increasingly monopolised with the advance of capitalism. In the US, a dozen of major monopolies control at least nine-tenths of the total production of roughly half of the country's 188 industries, plus at least 50 per cent of the other half. Monopolies hold dominant positions in other developed capitalist countries as well.

The emergence of monopolies, promoted by the growth of large-scale production, is an objective process. It is evident also in the young states that have chosen the capitalist path of de-

velopment. However, the scale of monopolies and degree of monopolisation are lower in those countries. Also, national monopolies are often dependent on the monopolies of major imperialist powers.

The development of monopolies increases the exploitation of the working people. The degree of exploitation is higher at monopoly enterprises employing advanced technologies and labour organisation methods. Due to their superior positions in the field of production and distribution, monopolies sell the goods produced at their enterprises at prices which ensure them enormous profits through, among other things, the exploitation of working people in newly independent states. Hence a new contradiction arises between the monopolies, and the rest of the national strata, all of which suffer from monopoly domination in one way or another.

Monopolies arise not only in production but also in banking. Alliances of major banks with many branches and affiliates are formed. Ties between banks and industry grow stronger. Industrial monopoly capital is merged with bank monopoly capital. The result is finance capital, the predominant form of capital at the stage of imperialism. It emerges as finance groups, with several major banking and industrial monopolies constituting the core of each group. They develop uniform policies for all monopolies within a group, and establish their control over a large number of firms embraced by the group. For instance, in the US there are 30 groups of this type; Japan, West Germany, France and Italy have approximately 10 such groups each. The distinguishing feature of finance capital is that, employing a broad range of methods and devices, it derives profits from the capital of other firms. The most effective one is the system of participation, i.e., the holding of shares in other firms. Giant pyramids of businesses are created in this way; at their summits are big capitalists controlling, through participation, capital considerably exceeding their own and hence increasing their profits.

Finance capital is owned by the monopoly bourgeoisie, who has assumed full political and economic power. In the United States the key positions in the national economy are occupied by 250-300 extremely rich families; in West Germany—by a few dozen families, and in Japan—some 300 families. The top

monopoly bourgeoisie—the financial oligarchy—leads a parasitical life and is increasingly antagonistic to society. It not only exploits the working people but also encroaches on the interests of the petty and middle bourgeoisie, and grows enormously rich on profits from war orders. The incomes of the financial oligarchy are multiplied by financial machinations.

The financial oligarchy occupies top positions not only in the economy but in all spheres of social life. Monopolies increasingly use the bourgeois state apparatus to promote their own interests. Lenin called this process the growth of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism. The financial tycoons occupy key positions in bourgeois governments, freely use public coffers for increasing their own wealth, maintain anti-labour legislation, and pursue aggressive foreign policies.

On the other hand, the economic role of the state is greater than before: it owns industrial enterprises and banks, undertakes procurement and sales transactions, uses the finance and credit system to regulate the capitalist economy. State-monopoly capitalism is essentially the fusion of the power of monopolies with the power of the bourgeois state, the result of which is a single state-monopoly mechanism.

On the basis of his in-depth analysis of imperialism, Lenin developed the doctrine created by Marx and Engels and came to some new conclusions relevant to the practice of revolutionary struggle. Lenin has proved that the stage of imperialism is the eve of a proletarian revolution.

Capitalism develops unevenly so far as industries and nations are concerned. This is preconditioned by the domination of private ownership, the drive for profits, and competition. At the stage of imperialism, the unevenness of capitalism's economic and political advance becomes ever more pronounced and acquires a leaps-and-bounds character. The uneven distribution of economic power within the imperialist world exacerbates the contradictions between imperialist countries.

Because of the uneven political development, the political prerequisites of a revolution mature at different times in different countries. Implied here are the degree of class contradictions and class struggle, the level of class consciousness and political organisation of the working class, the extent to which the non-proletarian strata are rallied around

the working class and influenced by the revolutionary parties.

Due to capitalism's uneven development, a socialist revolution could not take place in all capitalist countries simultaneously; it first occurred in one country. The transition from capitalism to socialism has taken, as Lenin predicted, a whole historical epoch.

Chapter Three

THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION AND THE EXPERIENCE OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

The year 1917 witnessed the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. The working people took over power in this vast country, stretching from the Arctic Coast to the torrid steppes of Central Asia and from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. Russia was the first country in the world to begin the building of a socialist society—a society of social justice.

How a Marxist Party Was Built Up in Russia

The Russian Empire—a country of the exploited and exploiters—existed for more than 1,000 years before it crumbled in 1917. The tsar, capitalists and landowners oppressed the Russian people and plundered other peoples living in Russia. The toiling masses had revolted several times, but, as in other countries, the numerous revolts by peasants and artisans, as well as national revolts, ended in defeat. Only the emergence of the working class and the proletarian movement in the 1880s gave a real perspective to the fight for freedom in Russia.

By that time, Marxism had widely spread in Western Europe. The works of Marx and Engels appeared in Russia. Russian revolutionaries began to circulate Marxist ideas: Marxist circles were set up in some cities. But they were isolated and, therefore, a revolutionary organisation, a party, was needed to bring them together.

The struggle for the creation of a revolutionary party in Russia is associated with the name of Lenin.

In 1895, Lenin united the isolated Marxist circles of St. Pe-

tersburg (Leningrad) into a consolidated revolutionary organisation—the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class. Thus, he started laying the foundations of a Marxist party.

The first congress of Russian Marxist organisations, which took place in 1898, proclaimed the creation of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP). Soon afterwards, however, the majority of the congress delegates and members of the newly elected Central Committee were arrested. In the absence of a single ideological and organisational centre, local RSDLP groups continued to work in isolation.

Lenin did not attend the congress. At the time, he was in Siberia, where he had been exiled after a 14-month solitary confinement. From that far-away land Lenin maintained secret correspondence with Marxist groups and established new ties. As soon as the term of his exile in Siberia was over, Lenin went abroad. In 1900, Lenin and other Russian Marxists set up the newspaper *Iskra*, the copies of which were secretly dispatched to Russia.

The *Iskra* denounced tsarist policies, published materials on the revolutionary movement and the situation of the working people, defined significant issues of Marxian theory, and established contacts between RSDLP groups and the editorial board. By that time Lenin had a number of fundamental works published, among them the book *What Is to Be Done?* His works were a creative elaboration of Marxism. They contained answers to vital theoretical and practical questions facing revolutionaries toward the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries.

Lenin's theoretical works and *Iskra's* entire organisational activities paved the way for a party congress. The Second RSDLP Congress, held in 1903, adopted the party's Programme and Rules worked out by Lenin and *Iskra* editors.

The Programme of the Party's Revolutionary Struggle

During those years opportunists prevailed among the European socialist theoreticians. They sought to prove that there was no longer any need for revolution, since the obtaining rapid development of productive forces was smoothing out class contra-

dictions and, therefore, the sole task of the workers' parties was to act through parliament, to "push" the bourgeoisie toward concessions and economic reforms.

Such opportunists appeared in Russia, too; they were called Economists. They asserted that workers were inadequately conscious politically and hence incapable of fighting for far-fetched political goals and ideals. They said that Socialists must support the workers' struggle for the satisfaction of their economic demands, leaving socio-political demands alone. They claimed that since workers at different enterprises put forward different economic demands, there was no need for a single consolidated proletarian party.

Lenin's RSDLP Programme charted a different historical perspective. It stated that in the new historical epoch, the contradictions of capitalism were growing more acute and spreading to ever new countries and continents. Even the technological progress and overall growth of wealth were but widening the gap between the propertied and increasing the number of poor and unemployed among ever broader strata of the working people.

While wresting insignificant economic concessions, workers continue to be the slaves of capital. Their cardinal economic interests may be satisfied only through political struggle and the victory of a socialist revolution. A socialist revolution abolishes the exploitation of man by man and creates conditions for a comprehensive development and well-being of society as a whole.

Still, the experience of revolutionary struggle proves that the oppressors never relinquish power without resistance. That is why to achieve victory the working class must take over political power and use it to crush the exploiters' resistance.

The RSDLP Programme pointed out that the abolition of tsarism and capitalist rule was impossible without a revolution. The building of socialism can be achieved only through a revolutionary transformation of society. Fighting for political supremacy, the working class has not only its own interests but also the interests of other working people in mind. It cannot emancipate itself without emancipating all the exploited people. This makes it possible to draw the oppressed to its side, since only socialism will free them from all forms of oppression.

That is why the Programme of Russia's revolutionary party promoted not only the interests of industrial workers but also the peasants' right to the land, and contained provisions against national and racial discrimination and for the right of each nation to decide its own destiny. All the exploited masses, said the Programme, can and must become the proletariat's ally in the interests of their own emancipation.

The Programme of the RSDLP pointed out that the proletariat needs an independent revolutionary party to consolidate its own ranks and draw all the downtrodden sections of society to its side, vanquish capitalism, and build a new society. However, the party cannot become a political leader unless it is itself guided by advanced Marxist theory. There is nothing more practical than a good theory. Disregarding the theory will surely lead to errors and defeats.

The party, armed with the Marxist theory, organises and educates the working class, introduces socialist consciousness (a clear understanding of the goals and methods of struggle) in the workers' movement. It guides all forms of the proletariat's class struggle—economic, political, and ideological—combining them in a single offensive against the oppressors. In the absence of such a party, the toiling masses are doomed to the political and ideological influence of the bourgeoisie.

The Second Congress approved the organisational principles laid down in the RSDLP Rules. One of the most important is the principle of proletarian internationalism. It manifests itself not only in the Party's ideology and policy but also in its structure, which ensures the unification of workers of different nationalities in Party organisations.

Democratic centralism is another cardinal principle. It means that the Party has a single discipline for all; one governing organ—the Party congress, and between the congresses—the elective Central Committee. The lower Party organs come under the higher ones, while the minority is subordinate to the majority.

The foundations of centralism must be necessarily combined with democratism: election of all governing Party bodies from top to bottom; accountability of all Party bodies to their own and higher organisations; the right of every Party member to elect and be elected to any Party body and to participate in the

discussion of all questions of the Party's policy and practices.

At the elections to the central RSDLP organs conducted at the Second Congress, Lenin and his followers won the majority and were since then called the Bolsheviks (from *bolshinstvo*—"majority"), while the opportunists who had the minority of the votes were thereafter called the Mensheviks (from *menshinstvo*—"minority").

The Party of Bolsheviks became a consolidated organisation of freely and consciously united revolutionaries, well aware of the goal of the struggle and the path to victory. Thus, the year 1903 saw the emergence in Russia of a Marxist party of a new type. The formation of the Party of Bolsheviks marked a turning-point in the history of the Russian and international working-class movements.

The Strategy and Tactics of Revolution

The ruling circles of tsarist Russia proved incapable of solving a single problem facing the country. Discontent gripped the majority of the popular masses. When the oppression and privations became unbearable, working people commenced an open struggle against the ruling regime.

On January 9, 1905, a procession of some 140 thousand St. Petersburg workers and their families, driven to despair by rightlessness and poverty, marched to present a petition to the tsar in the Winter Palace. The petition contained an appeal to the tsar to improve their deplorable situation. The peaceful procession was shot down by the troops. Even the most backward workers, those who had believed in the tsar-benefactor, then realised the futility of appeals and the need to fight. The proletariat launched an open struggle which marked the beginning of a revolution, the first popular revolution of the 20th century.

The proletariat was not alone in its struggle for Russia's democratisation. The peasants, comprising the majority of Russia's population, suffered from lack of political rights and land shortage, and from brutal exploitation by the landowners. Peasants put forth just demands, including confiscation of all the land of the tsar, landlords, and the church, and its transfer without compensation to those who tilled it.

National minorities suffered from a double oppression of

tsarism and local feudal lords and bourgeoisie. The Bolshevik Party supported their just demands of national equality and the right of each nation to self-determination. Only a firm alliance of the proletariat, peasants, and the national liberation movement could ensure victory for the revolution.

A revolutionary party armed with the knowledge of the laws of social evolution must be able to predict the course of events and become a guiding and mobilising force in the revolutionary process. Lenin described the tasks facing the Bolshevik Party in his work *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution.*

Bourgeois ideologists and opportunists reiterated that after the victory of the revolution the "ignorant" masses would not be able to govern the country. In their view, the bourgeoisie would rule Russia in future. The Party of Bolsheviks, however, outlined another tactic of the revolutionary struggle.

The time when the bourgeoisie led the popular masses had passed, said the Bolsheviks. Feudalism had impeded the advance of capitalism and, hence, the bourgeoisie's struggle for political power was in the interests of the entire people. In the 20th century, the bourgeoisie feared the revolutionary proletariat more than the feudal reactionaries. Russian capitalists were ready to accept a position in the government and strike a deal with tsarism to keep the working masses in check. Therefore, for the revolution to be successful it was necessary to prevent the bourgeoisie from deceiving the people. The Bolsheviks thought that the workers and peasants had to establish their own revolutionary-democratic power relying on armed masses, and to form their own revolutionary government comprised of men loyal to the people. That would be the power of the people, for the people, and by the people.

The tide of strikes was heightening from month to month. In October 1905, the All-Russia Political Strike began. It was the first nation-wide strike in the world and involved industrial and office workers, intellectuals and working people of many nationalities.

In the course of the strike there emerged, as a rule under the guidance of the Bolsheviks, Soviets of Workers' Deputies—councils made up of representatives of the working people in towns or districts. They included peasants, intellectuals and sol-

diers. Relying on the support of armed detachments, Soviets introduced the democratic order, established an eight-hour working day at industrial enterprises, prevented capitalists from closing down factories and from raising the prices of food products. They were the embryo of the future people's revolutionary power.

The working class and all the working people of Russia would have undoubtedly preferred to assume power in a peaceful way, but the tsarist regime was the first to take to arms. In response to that, an armed uprising broke out in December 1905. Moscow workers fought courageously at barricades but troops, using artillery against the insurgents, drowned the uprising in blood.

The revolution retreated offering stiff resistance. By June 1907, the first Russian revolution had been defeated. Its defeat was to a considerable extent due to the lack of unity of the workers' actions. Peasants were wavering, for many of them still believed the tsar and the bourgeoisie—who had promised a peaceful settlement of the land issue. Those sentiments largely determined the position of the army, in which peasants comprised the majority. The betrayal of the bourgeoisie—who had formerly opposed tsarism but later entered into an open deal with it against the people—also told on the fate of the revolution. Besides, European capitalist states rendered the tsar considerable help.

With the defeat of the revolution, a severe political reaction gripped the country. But the Party of Bolsheviks had learnt the art of fighting, and knew how to retreat. Notwithstanding all the repressions, Party cells continued to function secretly at factories and other enterprises. Those who wavered left the Party ranks, and Bolshevik workers headed the Party cells.

In those conditions, the Party developed new methods of struggle. The goal of the struggle was, as before, a democratic revolution. The tactics of the struggle was changed: a lengthy siege of tsarism instead of an open attack.

In working to consolidate the Party and strengthen its ties with the masses, Lenin was firmly opposed to both the "left" and the "right" varieties of opportunism.

The "left"—a small group of Party members—argued that it was beneath the Party to work within the remaining trade unions and other legal mass organisations controlled by the

police; that the Party should not be represented in the reactionary parliament (the State Duma) convened by the tsar to deceive the people, and must end its work among the peasants. In their view, the Party's objective was to start urgent preparations for a "purely proletarian" revolution. For this, it had to go deep underground, begin "military activities," encourage the workers to an armed uprising.

Had the Party decided to use those tactics, it would have lost its ties with the masses and turned into a numerically weak and helpless sect. In point of fact, the tactics of the "left" could have led to the Party's elimination; hence they were expelled from the Party.

The "right" opportunists—the Mensheviks—also disorganised and confused the workers. They held that a democratic revolution was impossible in the changed conditions, and that the proletariat's efforts had to be directed at protecting purely economic and occupational interests of the workers through organisations legalised by the government. They declared openly that they were for abandoning the revolutionary RSDLP Programme and for eliminating the illegal Party. This was an open treachery, so the Mensheviks—Liquidators—were also expelled from the RSDLP.

The Party concentrated its efforts on invigorating and organising the proletarian masses. The numerical strength of the Bolshevik cells was not very great but they managed to prove that a party's strength is not determined by the number of its members, but rather by its ability to influence and lead the masses. In 1910, the Russian working class started rising up again, and later launched a massive offensive against tsarism and the bourgeoisie.

The proletariat's massive offensive substantially expanded the movement's legal possibilities. In 1912, the Bolsheviks began the publication of a legal daily, *Pravda*. As with *Iskra*, the Bolsheviks proved that a newspaper may become a collective propagandist and agitator as well as a collective organiser of the masses.

The Party also used the State Duma (parliament) for its revolutionary propaganda. Landowners and the bourgeoisie comprised the majority in the Duma. The number of worker and peasant deputies was insignificant. Although not numerically

strong, the Bolshevik faction of the Duma found strength, not in interparliamentary combinations, but in its unity with the Bolshevik Party, which guided its activities and, organising mass strikes and demonstrations, supported Bolshevik deputies' political demands presented to the Duma.

Bolshevik deputies to the Duma condemned tsarism and the bourgeoisie, circulated Party slogans, protected workers' interests, and condemned every act of arbitrariness and injustice. Their stand found favour with the peasant deputies, who were gradually losing faith in the tsar and shedding off the influence of bourgeois ideologists.

Thus, legal and illegal activities were combined in a single flow of revolutionary struggle undermining the foundations of tsarism. A revolutionary situation once again developed in the country. Further exacerbation of the political crisis was, however, cut short in 1914 by the First World War.

The Downfall of Tsarism

It was a brutal and unjust war. Imperialists of Germany and Austro-Hungary clashed with their counterparts in Britain, France, Russia, and the United States over the division of colonies. The peoples of these countries had to pay for this with their blood: the war took a toll of over 10 million killed and 20 million wounded.

Long before the war broke out, the Bolsheviks had done what they could to prevent it. The leaders of European Socialist parties had sworn that they would prevent the war. However, when it did break out they were not only reluctant to oppose their governments but actually came in support of their imperialist policies. The workers' parties in those countries found themselves completely disorganised.

The Bolsheviks in Russia remained loyal to proletarian internationalism. Workers and peasants of different countries, Lenin said, must not shoot at each other, must not perish defending alien interests, but must turn their arms against the perpetrators of the war—their own governments; they must turn the imperialist war into a civil war, i.e., into a revolution. That slogan appealed to the working people in all countries and also signified the call to topple tsarism in Russia.

The tsarist government sought to crush the revolutionaries with brutal repressions. It sentenced members of the Bolshevik Duma faction to hard labour, closed down all legal workers' newspapers and organisations, and declared the Bolsheviks "traitors of their Motherland". But the members of the Leninist Party continued their courageous work, explaining to the masses the real causes of the imperialist massacre and agitating for a revolutionary outcome of the war.

The war led to a total disintegration of the Russian economy and greatly deteriorated the situation of the working people. The crisis at the top was exacerbating: the composition of the government was changing all the time, and it encountered ever more discords with the bourgeois parties displeased with Russia's defeats at the front. Another revolutionary situation was developing in Russia.

There were ever more strikes and revolutionary manifestations in the army and the navy. The peasant and national liberation movements were surging up. By 1917, the proletariat's struggle had acquired an even greater scope, force, and persistence. On February 23, 1917, mass strikes and demonstrations initiated a bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia.

In response to an appeal by the Bolsheviks, a general political strike was staged on February 25. The following day the entire work force of Petrograd (former St. Petersburg) was out in the streets. On the tsar's order, the army and police opened fire at the demonstrators; they could not halt the revolution, though.

The Bolsheviks called on the workers to arise. The best propagandists were sent to army barracks. On the morning of February 27, soldiers opened the arsenals for the workers and began to go over to the side of the people. By the end of the day, workers and soldiers had practically taken hold of the city. Members of the tsarist government were arrested; the tsar abdicated. During the next few days, the revolution triumphed all over the country.

True, the war weakened tsarism and hastened the revolutionary process. Still, the chief reason for the revolution's speedy triumph lay in the role played by the proletariat guided by the Bolsheviks. The victorious popular revolution crowned a long struggle by several generations.

The Peaceful Stage in the Revolution's Development

History knows many cases of revolutionary people scoring a victory as a result of long and bitter class battles, after which power fell into somebody else's hands. This was the case in Russia in February 1917.

In the course of the revolution the workers and soldiers reinstated the Soviets. As in 1905, they were revolutionary-democratic power organs of the proletariat and the peasantry. The new Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies became a real and powerful force, since they were supported by the people and the army.

The revolution involved the broadest sections of the population in political life. However, the majority of soldiers—yesterday's peasants—were totally inexperienced in political struggle. The entire proletarian mass was neither adequately organised nor politically educated. The people, rejoicing in victory, were overly trustful. Bolshevik leaders were in prison or in emigration, while the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries (SRs) had among them seasoned demagogues and political intriguers. The people believed them and elected them to the leadership of the Soviets. By its numerical strength, the sweeping petty-bourgeois tide swamped and overwhelmed the politically aware vanguard of the working class.

The Mensheviks and SRs were of the opinion that the bourgeois class alone was fit to become "the master" in Russia. They secretly colluded with the leaders of bourgeois parties and, on behalf of the Soviets, insisted on the formation of a bourgeois government. So it came about that dual power was established in the country—the power of the Soviets, representing the revolutionary-democratic proletariat and the peasantry, and a bourgeois government.

In April 1917, Lenin returned to Russia after a long period of forced emigration. At a meeting of Petrograd Bolsheviks, he delivered a report, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution", which came to be known as the "April Theses". The bourgeoisie will never meet the demands put forth by the working people who took to revolutionary struggle, said Lenin. Waging the bloody war at a huge profit, the bourgeoisie is interested in prolonging it and, consequently,

cannot give peace to the people worn out by the war.

Neither is the bourgeoisie able to end economic dislocation and hunger. For this, it would have to confiscate the landowners' estates, convert them into the property of the entire people, and give the land to peasants without compensation. Supervision by workers over the production and distribution of the entire stock of output is needed; all the banks must be merged into a single national Bank to be controlled by the Soviets. But the bourgeoisie will never agree to these measures.

Therefore, the workers and peasants must not support the bourgeois government. The people's demands can be satisfied only by a socialist revolution carried out by the proletariat in alliance with the village poor and the working people of oppressed nations, that is, with the vast majority of the country's population.

Lenin pointed out that the dual power could not exist for long. He put forward the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!". The Soviets could not become the organs of proletarian power relying on the popular masses unless the Bolsheviks constituted a majority within them. Then a peaceful transition to a socialist revolution would be possible.

The Bolsheviks began to rally all revolutionary forces, first of all by concentrating efforts on political invigoration of the Soviets, trade unions, and other mass workers' organisations.

The Mensheviks and SRs sought in every way to contain the proletarian initiative. They promised that the government would issue laws to improve the situation of the destitute working people. With time, however, the situation was growing worse. And so the Bolsheviks supported the revolutionary initiative of the workers who were establishing at their enterprises workers' control over production, distribution of food supplies, employment and dismissal, and remuneration; introducing an 8-hour working day; improving working conditions, and setting up Red Guard detachments.

The Bolsheviks also supported those peasants who did not wait for the Mensheviks' and SRs' promises to come true but seized landowners' estates. The Bolsheviks also supported the national liberation movement of the oppressed national minorities at the outskirts of Russia.

In June 1917, when it became known that the bourgeois government was preparing an offensive at the front, workers and soldiers took to the streets again. They were becoming increasingly aware that the "kingdom of freedom" they had been promised had in fact amounted to the "right" to be killed at the front and the "freedom" to starve to death in the rear. That brand of bourgeois democracy had now failed to satisfy the popular masses.

At the time, the bourgeoisie, too, was not content with the democratic forms of government. It was aware that revolutionary sentiments and Bolshevik influence were spreading among the masses. The bourgeoisie saw the way out in the establishment of a military dictatorship capable of drowning the revolution in blood. Hence, a consolidation of counter-revolutionary forces for the purpose of reinstating the monarchy began.

The new offensive at the front was defeated; several tens of thousands of soldiers were killed or crippled for no purpose. In July, powerful protest demonstrations were staged in Petrograd and other cities. The people demanded an end to the war and the transfer of power to the Soviets. Though the demonstrations were peaceful in character, the participants were shot at on the government's orders. Disbandment of workers' organisations and mass arrests of Bolsheviks followed. Counter-revolution launched an onslaught.

The Bolsheviks' Course of an Armed Uprising

On July 26, 1917, the Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party was held secretly at the outskirts of Petrograd. Lenin was in hiding at the time, but all the Congress decisions were worked out under his guidance.

The Congress pointed out that only a socialist revolution could save the country from the impending disaster. At the time, however, it was no longer possible to effect it by peaceful means. The peaceful stage in the revolution's development was over because the bourgeoisie had taken up arms against the people. At that time the political and economic domination of the capitalists could not be ended otherwise than by force. So the Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party decided on a course of an armed uprising.

The Bolsheviks continued their work among the masses, making use of both legal and illegal forms of propaganda. The tide of political and economic strikes was rising. The Red Guard was growing strong. Industrial workers were introducing workers' control at their enterprises; peasants were taking over landowners' estates. A revolutionary situation was once more shaping up in Russia.

Counter-revolutionary generals, supported by the capitalists and landowners, deemed the moment a favourable one for introducing a military dictatorship. They moved the regiments loyal to them from the front to Petrograd. The Bolsheviks appealed to the masses: the Red Guard and revolutionary regiments stood up in defence of the capital. Revolutionary agitators were dispatched to the advancing counter-revolutionary troops, and the soldiers refused to carry out the generals' orders. The mutiny fell through.

In September and October, the Bolsheviks won the vast majority in the Soviets in Petrograd as well as in other industrial centres. Revolutionary Military Committees were set up to defend the revolution. They were attached to the Soviets and guided the Red Guard, revolutionary soldiers and sailors.

Russia found itself at the crossroads. It had to choose between a military dictatorship (which would result, eventually, in the reinstatement of the monarchy) and the power of the workers in alliance with the poorest sections of the peasants, that is, the first ever working people's state. There was no other alternative and no time to waste.

A meeting of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, chaired by Lenin, was held in Petrograd on October 10. The meeting adopted a decision on an armed uprising. The Central Committee appealed to all the organisations, all workers and soldiers, to speed up the preparation of the uprising.

That time, too, the bourgeois government was the first to open hostilities. Loyal troops were gradually transferred from the front to the capital; bridges were taken over, and streets patrolled. It was, however, impossible to halt the revolutionary tide. The Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies had the revolutionary regiments, the Baltic Fleet and the Red Guard detachments ready for action.

The Revolution Triumphs

Lenin headed the leadership of the uprising. Acting on his order, the revolutionary regiments recaptured the bridges, seized the railway stations, the Central Post Office, the Telephone Exchange, and the State Bank in the early hours of October 25 (November 7). By the morning, it became clear that the uprising had been victorious.

The Congress of Soviets held on the next day announced the takeover of power by the Soviets of Workers', Peasants', and Soldiers' Deputies. It approved Lenin's Decree on Peace. That document contained the idea of peaceful coexistence of states with different political systems. The Decree proclaimed equality for all peoples, denounced seizure of foreign territories, and declared war the gravest of crimes against humanity. Revolutionary Russia appealed to all nations and governments to start immediate negotiations on democratic peace.

The Congress also approved another historic document—Lenin's Decree on Land. It abolished private ownership of land and placed the land at the disposal of the entire people. All landed estates taken over from the landlords, the Church, and the bourgeoisie were divided up among peasants for use.

The Congress of Soviets formed the first Soviet government, the Soviet of People's Commissars headed by Lenin.

After its victory in Petrograd, the armed uprising swept over the entire vast territory of the country—a socialist revolution had triumphed in Russia.

The October Revolution became a turning-point in world history; it initiated the irreversible process of the replacement of capitalism with a new, communist socio-economic system. The construction of a new world began.

The socialist revolution fulfilled the dreams of many generations of Russian working people: the adoption of laws on an 8-hour working day, social insurance, free medical services for the workers; nationalisation (conversion into a national property) of the railways, banks, and some major industrial enterprises. Strict workers' control of production management was established at all privately owned enterprises. Workers abandoned slums and moved into dwellings formerly occupied by the rich.

The land, now a national property, was placed at the disposal of the peasants, without compensation, to be distributed by themselves in accordance with local conditions and the size of families.

The Soviet government put an end to national inequality. It proclaimed equality and sovereignty for all nations, unhindered development for all national minorities and ethnic groups, and the right of each nation to self-determination up to secession and formation of an independent state. It abolished all national privileges and restrictions and proclaimed freedom of every citizen to profess any religion, as well as inviolability of customs and national and cultural institutions of the formerly oppressed nations.

Women were given equal rights with men. The Church was separated from the state and the school. Free general education was introduced.

The State Bank was nationalised while the privately owned banks were placed under the control of the Soviets to prevent an outflow of the people's wealth abroad. The enormous foreign debts of the tsarist and bourgeois governments were revoked. Thus Russia was freed from the financial fetters of international capitalism. The drafting of long-term programmes for the country's economic development began under Lenin's guidance.

The exploiter classes could not reconcile themselves to the loss of privileges and the victory of the Revolution. They offered fierce resistance. Owners closed down their enterprises in response to the introduction of workers' control. In their bid to paralyse the functioning of Soviet institutions, old government officials tried everything possible to interfere with them; capitalists, with the help of private banks, financed their sabotage.

An army officers' mutiny broke out in the capital a few days after the proclamation of Soviet government, but all the necessary measures were taken, so it was suppressed. The government confiscated the private enterprises closed down by their owners and nationalised them on the workers' request. Because of their subversive activities and aid to the counter-revolutionaries, private banks were also nationalised.

The Soviet government was magnanimous: capital punishment was abolished. The mutinous officers and generals who had risen

against the revolution arms in hand, as well as former bourgeois government ministers were set free "on their word of honour". The magnanimity, however, bore sour fruit. There were more and more acts of terrorism against leaders of the Revolution, and numerous counter-revolutionary mutinies; many Soviet activists were massacred. The officers and generals set free by the Soviet government fled to the outskirts of the country, built up counter-revolutionary armies, and launched an offensive against the Soviet Republic. Thus the overthrown exploiter classes unleashed a civil war.

The Civil War and Intervention

"Violence is, of course, alien to our ideals," wrote Lenin.[1] However, the Bolsheviks realised that non-resistance to evil may well result in its full triumph. The Revolution fought its enemies with their own weapon. It was a war of the downtrodden against rabid reaction. The Civil War would not have lasted for long but for the intervention of foreign imperialist powers in Russia's internal affairs. They rendered aid to all counter-revolutionary insurgents and conspirators. When it became clear that the internal reaction could not crush the Revolution, imperialists launched an open intervention.

What happened then vividly demonstrated that the imperialists cannot be appeased with a unilateral disarmament by a working people's state. The Decree on Peace, adopted on the day of the victory of the October Revolution, called on all governments to cease military hostilities. Demobilisation of the old Russian army was also begun at the time. Soviet Russia found itself more or less defenceless in the face of intervention. The imperialist governments rejected all the peace proposals and, in violation of the international norms, moved their troops to occupy Soviet Russia.

The crusade against the Soviet Rupublic involved 14 capitalist states. American, British, French, and Japanese troops landed in the north, south, and east of the country. German soldiers began a sweeping offensive in the west. The interventionists also

---

[1] V.I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 69.

supplied counter-revolutionary Russian troops with arms, uniforms, money, and advisers.

In February 1918, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Government appealed to the nation with the slogan, "The Socialist Fatherland Is in Danger!". Industrial workers and the village poor rose in defence of the Soviet power. The Red Army began to be formed from among workers and peasants of all nationalities of Russia, as well as volunteer internationalists from other countries. This ensured the unity of the army and the people, and also helped build up a safe and reliable rear. The Red Army was organised as a regular army with strict military discipline based on the principles of unified command and centralism. No other army would have been able to withstand the attacks of the trained regular troops of the allied forces of intervention and counter-revolution.

Soviet Russia became a veritable military camp. Compulsory labour was introduced to ensure supplies for the Red Army and to stave off hunger among the civil population; peasants were left no more products than what was needed to feed the family. Profiteers were punished as the Revolution's worst enemies. The Red Army and workers were given priority in supplies. Catering was organised for children free of charge.

The Red Army drew its strength from the just nature of its goals and from its close ties with the people and the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. All political and military matters concerning defence and combat operations were discussed at length at Party meetings and Central Committee sessions, and Party decisions were then implemented through Bolshevik Party cells in city and village Soviets, at industrial enterprises, and in Red Army units.

The Civil War lasted three years. The Red Army, at first poorly armed and clothed, gradually gained strength and combat experience. At times the ring of the enemy armies was so close that the territory of the Soviet Republic amounted to just a few regions in Central Russia. In such times of mortal danger, the Republic summoned up all its resources and neutralised the onslaught of the counter-revolutionary armies with a crushing blow. By the end of 1920, nearly all the territory of Russia had been freed from interventionists and counter-revolutionaries. It was a great victory for the Land of Soviets.

The Building of a Working-People State

The workers and peasants of Russia began to build their own state immediately after the victory of the socialist revolution. Although state power was now in their hands, they could not use the old government machinery because it had been established to repress and oppress the people. The working people, led by the Communist Party, had to build up a new government apparatus.

The first Soviet Constitution, adopted by the All-Russia Congress of Soviets in July 1918, embodied the creative revolutionary experience of the masses. It formulated the fundamental tasks of the worker and peasant state—suppression of exploiters' resistance, abolition of the oppression of man by man, and construction of a socialist society.

The Soviets exercised full authority at the central and local levels. The principle of electivity, replacement and recall of deputies in accordance with the will of their electors ensured close ties between the authorities and the people, helped the working people control the activities of their representatives, and made it possible for the masses to learn the art of management and also, in fact, influence the political decision-making.

At the time the Soviets were not national but class organisations. Only working people could be elected to the Soviets. In view of the extremely acute nature of the class struggle and the specific conditions of the Civil War, such an extreme measure as denying representatives of all the exploiter classes the right to vote was stipulated in the Constitution.

At the same time, the Constitution legalised certain advantages for the working class as the most politically conscious and organised class that had borne the brunt of the struggle against tsarism and the bourgeoisie. The percentage of workers in the Soviets was higher than that of peasants. In Russia, where the petty-bourgeois strata constituted the majority of the population, that measure secured the working people's power.

Having assumed the responsibility for the fate of the country, the Communists called on all those who cherished the gains of the socialist revolution to cooperate with them. The Mensheviks and the SRs lost their influence over the masses. Both organisations sought the positions of a "neutral third party". But no

revolution permits neutrality; everyone has to choose one or the other side of the barricades. Those who opposed Communists inevitably, sometimes against their own wish, served the purposes of the most reactionary forces. Because of their vacillations and vague political programmes, the petty-bourgeois parties lost the trust of the people. The people sided with the Communists, in whom they saw reliable defenders of their vital interests.

Thus a political system emerged in Russia under which leadership was vested in one party—the Leninist Communist Party.

During the first years of Soviet government, the Party's attention was focussed on questions pertaining to the defence of the Revolution. Its entire political, ideological and organisational activities were geared towards this goal. With time, as the counter-revolutionary onslaught was successfully resisted, the task of large-scale organisation of the working people for the construction of a new—socialist— society gradually came to the fore. This task was extremely difficult and complicated.

Towards a Society of Social Justice

Socialism is a society of social justice; it knows no exploitation of man by man. It is possible to achieve this only if private ownership is abolished and public ownership of the means of production established. This promotes voluntary collective labour, labour productivity, and utilisation of scientific and technological achievements.

The revolution took possession of factories and plants belonging to the bourgeoisie and confiscated the land of the landlords. Nationalisation of industrial enterprises, banks, and transport, as well as the setting up of the first few collective farms by peasants, laid the foundation of the public sector and of the socialist socio-economic structure. There were, however, other modes as well.

The small industrial and merchant enterprises left in the charge of their former owners and the holdings of rich peasants (*kulaks*) constituted the private-capitalist economic structure. There were also a great number of artisans primarily peasants, who produced goods for sale without exploiting the labour of others. The mass of small owners and their holdings made up another economic structure—the small-scale commodity production. Finally, there were quite a few small peasant holdings producing an insignificant amount of products solely

for personal use. They comprised the extremely backward, so-called patriarchal structure.

As Lenin pointed out in his work *The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government* written in 1918, socialism can be built only by overcoming and transforming the multistructural socio-economic life. The Soviet state used political power to strengthen and develop the socialist structure, gradually turning it into a dominant economic structure. This comprised the main content of the lengthy period of transition to the triumph of socialism.

However, the situation that had emerged in the country was impeding the solution of this task. The Soviet state, bled white by the war, possessed no means for rehabilitating the industrial production. It could not count upon the help of other countries either, since the imperialist powers maintained an economic blockade of the Soviet Republic, and many plants and factories were shut down for that reason. Industrial production was at its very lowest level. There was growing discontent among the less politically conscious sections of the workers. Some left for the countryside, others joined handicraft industries; the numerical strength of the proletariat thus reduced substantially. All this weakened the political position of the working class.

The situation was just as difficult in the countryside. When the Civil War was on, there was a real threat of counter-revolution emerging victorious, in which case the peasants would lose the land. Faced with this threat, the peasants gave to the Soviet state all the surplus food products. With the end of the Civil War, and no longer faced with the danger of losing the land, the peasants were growing more and more displeased with the existing system of food requisitions. They demanded that the tax in kind be reduced and that the ban on free grain trade, introduced during the Civil War, be lifted.

Some Communists asserted that only coercive measures could help overcome the difficulties of the transition period. They thought that the working people were too lazy, and that therefore military discipline should be introduced at all industrial enterprises to make workers work better. They suggested that the share of agricultural produce requisitioned from the peasants be increased and all measures taken to speed up the collectivisation, thus eliminating small peasant holdings.

Others suggested that the Party should abstain from any interference in the economic processes under way and from any planned management of the national economy by the state; that management should be left directly to work collectives at enterprises. Such policies, involving abandonment of planned economic management by the state, could lead to a total disarray and anarchy in the national economy.

Lenin realised that all those proposals could spell disaster for the socialist state. He argued that coercive measures could only apply to those who tried to topple Soviet government. As for the labouring masses, the Party had to prove to them the correctness of its policies. Peasants were more than just small owners; they were toilers who actively participated in the Revolution and its defence. Moreover, they constituted the majority of the population, and the people's state had to take their interests into account. Therefore, it was expedient to work out a socio-economic policy that would make the programme of socialist changes understandable as well as attractive to every honest worker.

Following discussions at all levels, the Party approved a new set of economic, social, and political measures worked out by Lenin, which came to be known as the New Economic Policy (NEP).

The laws promulgated thereafter satisfied, first of all, the just demands of the toiling peasants. The tax in kind was now levied depending on the size and quality of each particular plot of land. Having settled his account with the state, each peasant could sell the remaining produce on the market. So, the better he worked and, hence, the bigger the harvest, the greater the part of it he could sell on the market. Poor peasants were exempted from paying the tax. These measures immediately raised the peasants' interests in expanding agricultural production.

At the same time, having captured the commanding heights of the national economy (the banks, foreign trade, transport and communications, and all large factories and plants), the Soviet state began to lease small-scale and, in some cases, medium-scale enterprises to private businessmen. The state encouraged the development of cottage industries and various handicrafts and permitted the running of private workshops, trade outlets, diners, and restaurants.

At first glance, it looked like the state had given in to capitalist

elements. A closer look, however, revealed that it was primarily the toiling peasants who benefited through these measures. They became aware that the Soviet state correctly understood and safeguarded their interests. Their trust soon stabilised the political situation in the countryside.

Expanding agricultural production in their own interest, the peasants helped the state overcome economic dislocation, saved workers from hunger, and supplied industry with raw materials. In turn, the latter gradually adjusted to production of the goods needed in the countryside. A solid economic foundation was thus built for a long-term alliance of the peasantry and the working class. Consolidation of this alliance meant consolidation of Soviet government.

The Soviet state safeguarded the interests of industrial workers and toiling peasants. Acting through the Soviets, trade unions, finance organisations and other agencies, the state controlled the duration and conditions of work, the size of pay, and the length of annual leaves, that is, it supervised the observation of all Soviet laws. The progressive taxation of private entrepreneurs in town and countryside set limits on their profits. The state saw to it that their profits were not gained through speculation but through expansion of the production of food, clothes, footwear and other goods.

State control, therefore, set certain boundaries within which private enterprise could develop. Moreover, taxation of private entrepreneurs and merchants increased the finances of the Soviet Republic. These funds were then allocated for rehabilitation of major socialist enterprises. At state-owned plants and factories production was arranged and pay system improved in accordance with the amount and quality of work done by each person.

Therefore, the essence of the policy conducted by the Soviet state was not one of concessions to capitalist elements but rather the use of private capital to consolidate the state sector of the economy. That was the principal objective of the entire period of transition to socialism.

Those were difficult years for Soviet Communists. They faced the task of learning to run the country and also of coping with economic and trade management better than merchants and capitalists. Now the bourgeoisie was not behind the front lines, as

during the Civil War, but close by. Its striving for profits and luxury, its psychology of money-grabbing, and its way of life infected not only the petty-bourgeois strata but also wavering workers and even some immature Communists.

The ruling Communist Party was increasingly being joined by alien elements—those who sought the Party card in the hope of securing lucrative posts. Expedient measures were taken: a purge of all Party organisations was carried out at open meetings with the participation of non-Party workers. All passive and wavering elements, careerists, government officials and managerial workers guilty of red tape were expelled. This raised the Party's authority and moral prestige in the eyes of the working people. Rallied by the unity of outlook and action, the Communists led the country to socialism.

Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Following the socialist revolution which, for the first time in history, granted all the nations inhabiting the country the right of statehood, independent Soviet republics were formed in the territories inhabited by national minorities. However, the consolidation of Soviet power there was impeded by the economic and cultural backwardness of most of those regions and also by the influence of the indigenous bourgeoisie and clergy who instigated hostility among nations.

Soviet Russia's national policy was aimed at eliminating the backwardness of national outskirts, creating an alliance of equal nations, and promoting mutual assistance and friendship among peoples. This policy facilitated the eradication of national strife and encouraged trust among these peoples. The socio-economic changes carried out in Central Russia served as a good example for the working people of all nationalities. Even in the most backward regions, it helped gradually turn the national liberation struggle into a socialist movement of oppressed workers and peasants.

It became obvious that no republic could withstand the allied forces of internal and external counter-revolution single-handed. That is why the republics concluded an agreement on mutual military assistance with Soviet Russia. This alliance grew

stronger in the course of the Civil War, with the armed forces of all the republics united in a single Red Army. Some management, supply, and transportation agencies were likewise merged. Common battles against the counter-revolutionaries glued the friendship of the emancipated peoples.

After the Civil War, economic cooperation among the Soviet republics began to acquire increasing importance. It became clear that none of them could rehabilitate the economy and continue to effect socialist changes drawing solely on its own internal resources, without mutual aid and industrial assistance of Soviet Russia.

That is why, an economic alliance was formed towards the end of 1920, in addition to the military and political alliance of these countries. It was embodied in agreements concluded between Soviet Russia and other republics on joint rehabilitation and development of the national economy. This selfless assistance rendered by the workers and peasants of Russia to the working people of other regions strengthened their friendship still more.

In 1922, the military-political, and economic alliance of the Soviet republics was bolstered by a diplomatic alliance. So, after five years of common struggle, life itself dictated the formation of a single socialist state.

In December of the same year, representatives of all the national republics met in Moscow, where they considered and approved an agreement on the creation of a voluntary union of equal sovereign states, which was elaborated by Lenin—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Industrialisation of the Country

The young Soviet state's successful rebuff of the allied forces of internal and external counter-revolution, the formation of the USSR, and the rehabilitation of the country's national economy within a short time to the pre-war level were great achievements. The prewar (1913) level was, however, the level of backward tsarist Russia.

The country's advance was held up by its economic, first of all industrial, backwardness more than anything else. Machinery and equipment were scarce both in industry and agriculture. The tsarist regime had been buying them abroad, but the USSR

could not import machinery. It was faced by constant military threat from imperialist powers.

Therefore, in his plans for further socialist construction, which provided for deep-going changes in the economy, social relations, ideology, and culture, Lenin stressed the necessity of industrialising the country. The building of up-to-date industry could ensure a steady rise of the working people's well-being, economic independence, and greater defence capability. Collectivisation of agriculture and a cultural revolution were to be carried out on the basis of industrialisation.

Lenin died on January 21, 1924. It was a grave and irreplaceable loss for the Soviet people and the working people throughout the world. There remained, however, the Communist Party built by Lenin, his vast ideological legacy, and his plan for building socialism. So the Party embarked on the course of industrialisation.

The tasks to be tackled required great financial resources. The needed funds came from internal sources: incomes of socialist industrial enterprises, transport, banks, and foreign trade. Money came through strict economies in the use of state funds; taxation (notably from higher tax rates on the incomes of exploiting elements in urban areas and the countryside), and internal government loans from industrial and office workers and peasants, who actively supported the policy of industrialisation.

Socialist industrialisation was carried out on the basis of scientific plans for the development of the national economy. The first was the State Plan for the Electrification of Russia drawn up under Lenin's guidance in 1920. When industrialisation began, it was decided to draw up socio-economic development plans for five-year periods. The first five-year plan covered the years 1928-1932; the second—1933-1937.

The country became a great construction site. Thousands of steel mills, engineering and machine-tool plants were set up to produce modern equipment for the heavy and light industries. New coal pits, mines, oilfields, roads, and railway lines were built. Giant industries and whole cities sprang up in Siberia, the Soviet Far East, and Soviet Central Asia—the areas rich in natural resources. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the organiser and manager of country-wide construction. The

Party dispatched its best cadres to the vital areas of industrialisation.

Millions of workers showed so much zeal and enthusiasm in the implementation of the first and second five-year plans that the targets were actually reached ahead of time, and socialist industrialisation was carried out in the shortest time possible. Over 6,000 industrial facilities—including modern electric power stations, mines, coal pits, oilfields, giant plants and factories—were commissioned during the two first five-year economic development periods. New industries, unknown to old Russia, sprang up, among them automobile, tractor, aircraft and chemical industries.

From a backward agrarian country depending on foreigh capital, the USSR was transformed into an economically independent industrial state.

Collectivisation of Agriculture

Profound socialist changes in agriculture, dictated by life itself, were effected in the course of industrialisation. The large-scale construction boosted the growth of the urban population. However, the amount of grain coming in from the countryside had not increased.

Before the Revolution, peasants did not have enough to eat, since they had to sell the greater part of their produce in order to settle their debts with landlords or village *kulaks*. Now, having received plots of land for use free of charge, they consumed the greater part of what they produced. Small peasant holdings with their primitive agricultural tools and farming methods—and, subsequently, low harvests—were incapable of increasing production to meet the entire population's requirements in food.

That is why the Communist Party began a step-by-step collectivisation of the countryside in accordance with Lenin's co-operation plan—a major component of the general strategy of building socialism.

Various forms of cooperation were already widespread among the rural population. Joining in land tillers', marketing, and buyers' cooperatives and finance-and-credit associations, peasants saved labour, time, and money. In the bourgeois state, though, cooperation was a capitalist form of production organi-

sation; it exploited wage labour and was totally dependent on banks and the village rich.

It is only in a state where political power and the key posts in the national economy are held by working people that co-operation opens up the possibility of switching to a really voluntary collective labour without any exploitation, that is, the possibility of switching from small-scale peasant farming to large-scale socialist agriculture making use of up-to-date technologies and scientific achievements.

In his work *On Co-Operation* (1923), Lenin pointed out the need to strictly adhere to the principles of voluntary cooperation and material incentives, so that the peasants would see the benefits of joint collective labour. Then they would gradually go over from simple to more complex forms of cooperation—from consumer cooperatives to collective land-tilling, harvesting, etc.

Socialist transformations in the countryside do not occur spontaneously but with effective economic support by the state in the form of real incentives to collective farms and active political and educational work carried out among the rural population. This work began in the first days of Soviet power. Peasant consciousness was changing, and from late 1929 not only poor but also middle peasants started joining collective farms in the principal grain-growing regions. These regions initiated total collectivisation.

From the very beginning, the process of socialist transformation in the countryside met with fierce resistance from wealthy villagers (the *kulaks*). They campaigned against collective farms by spreading outrageous lies. In cases of perceptible shortage of foodstuffs the kulaks substantially reduced grain sales in order to inflate grain prices. They were convinced that they could dictate their terms to the Soviet government and thwart collectivisation.

Therefore, the Soviet government was obliged to apply the force of law to those who let grain rot rather than sell it to the state. Their farms were either heavily fined or confiscated. As collectivisation was gaining more ground, kulaks resorted to organised mutinies, arson, and assassination of Communists and village leaders. The state responded by expropriating kulak holdings and property, that is, the kulaks' possessions acquired

through exploitation of the village poor were confiscated. The rich peasants' destiny was decided at general meetings of villagers. The confiscated possessions became cooperative property of the newly-created collective farms. Thus, the last and biggest exploiter group ceased to exist.

The Soviet state then focussed attention on strengthening collective farms. Land tenure was gradually streamlined, supplies of machinery increased, and the pay system improved. Finally, the appropriate type of producers' cooperative was determined: the collective farm (*kolkhoz*).

In kolkhozes the land, the bulk of draught and productive livestock, as well as barns and other facilities were socialised. Kolkhoz members elected the management. The income was distributed according to the quantity and quality of work done. Each kolkhoz peasant owned a dwelling house and individual holding: a small plot of land, livestock, and poultry. This type of cooperative, taking into account both public and personal interests, was the most suitable for the peasants.

Thus, collectivisation induced a cardinal change in the peasants' life. The Soviet village, which had been backward and comprised of small peasant holdings, became a large-scale mechanised agricultural settlement where economic relationships were based on socialist cooperative ownership.

The Cultural Revolution

Along with industrialisation and collectivisation, a cultural revolution was carried out in the USSR in accordance with Lenin's plan of building socialism.

Old Russia left the Soviet country a painful legacy: three-fourths of the population were illiterate (four out of every five peasants could not read or write). In some regions, such as Central Asia, illiteracy had engulfed practically the entire population.

The October Revolution and the transfer of power to the working class were the decisive conditions for the cultural development of the broad popular masses. A rise in the people's cultural level, in turn, was a relevant condition of further socialist advancement.

Socialism's objective is to draw all the working people into active political life and state administration. An illiterate person, as everyone would agree, can take no part in political life and,

moreover, can be easily confused by political reactionaries and demagogues.

To ensure the people's well-being, a socialist society must have a highly developed economy based on the latest achievements of science and technology. But an illiterate or poorly educated person is not capable of utilising scientific achievements.

Finally, a socialist society strives to ensure an all-round and harmonious development of the personality. An illiterate or poorly educated person, however, cannot share the wealth of human knowledge and culture.

That is why Lenin considered that the working people would have to undergo a long process of cultural development on their way to a victorious socialism. For this, the masses were to attain a certain level of education which would give them access to public life, education, and works of literature and art. The main thing is to ensure working people's assimilation of the revolutionary theory, develop socialist culture, science, and art, and on this foundation overcome the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois outlook and mentality and transform the people's consciousness and entire intellectual sphere on the principles of scientific socialism.

The primary task was to stamp out illiteracy, and all government and public organisations were involved in this work. That task, aside from the teaching corps, was entrusted to scholars, the Red Army personnel, school and university students—in fact, all those who could teach others to read, write, and count. The society "Away with Illiteracy" was voluntarily joined by over 5 million people. Short-term courses and schools sprang up all over the country, and soon millions of workers and peasants were slowly and assiduously writing down the first sentence of the new ABC book: "We are not slaves."

The system of education was gradually expanded and improved. The single school, set up after the October Revolution, combined instruction in native languages with useful labour and public work; it made knowledge accessible to all children of working families. The number of schools and teachers was permanently on the rise. This made it possible first to introduce a compulsory four-year education and later—a compulsory seven-year education. At present, the country has a 10-year compulsory education.

With literacy on the rise, the people's cultural level became higher. Newspapers and magazines, political and fiction works were published on a mass scale. Rich art and book collections that had previously belonged to the landlords and bourgeoisie were handed over to libraries and museums to become accessible to all.

Community centres, new theatres, cinema houses, and exhibitions were set up in the cities. Reading-rooms and clubs were opened, and mobile film projectors were sent to the remotest rural districts of the country. Amateur performances—song and dance groups, bands, theatrical troupes—began to acquire mass character. Previously, art had been accessible only to the rich and wealthy; now it was available to the entire population.

In the first years of socialist construction, there were not enough qualified specialists. Although many prominent scientists, engineers, men of letters, artists, and the military were on the side of the people, a great number of intellectuals did not accept the new order. Communists were firm and patient in their effort to win the old specialists over to their side; the latter were even given higher salaries. Scientists and scholars were given ample opportunities to realise their projects aimed at advancing science and culture and putting the country on the road to prosperity. This was the most important thing for the democratic and patriotic sections of the intelligentsia, so they began to cooperate with the Soviet government.

A cardinal reform of higher school, aimed at providing enough specialists for the Soviet state, was carried out. The number of higher educational establishments grew significantly. The content of teaching programmes and the composition of the student body were changing, too. Workers' faculties for capable young people—workers, peasants, and demobilised Red Army men—were opened at higher schools. After a short time, they were ready to cope with university programmes and subsequently completed institutions of higher learning. They constituted the first generation of the new intelligentsia.

Science, which had assumed national importance, was advancing at a fast pace. Its development, moreover, had a planned and purposeful character, and in many areas of knowledge Soviet researchers were at the forefront of science, leaving behind

scientists of highly industrialised capitalist countries. The distinguishing characteristic of Soviet science was its close link with the practice of socialist construction, the elaboration of fundamental as well as applied problems.

Ignorance and lack of culture were becoming a thing of the past. Socialist construction itself was the principal school of education and enlightenment for the masses. People could see life changing before their own eyes. They could see for themselves that the new society was just: those who worked in earnest for the benefit of their country enjoyed society's respect. Socialist principles of life were gradually established in society, such as "He who does not work, neither shall he eat" and "All for one and one for all".

Major objectives of the cultural revolution were attained. Millions of people had been taught to read and write. They were introduced to science and socialist culture, took an active part in political life and in building a new society.

The Transformation of National Outskirts

Striking changes occurred in Russia's national outskirts (remote regions inhabited by national minorities). The tsarist government used to look upon these regions as its colonies serving as a source of cheap raw materials, and major industries were practically non-existent there. From the very beginning of the country's industrialisation, large-scale construction projects were started in these regions.

The important thing was to settle the problem in such a way as to make working people of different nationalities (of whom many belonged to ethnic groups that had not yet passed the feudal stage) see socialist industrialisation as serving their vital interests. Hence the Party's policy in those regions took into account the historically rooted local customs and traditions. While in other regions priority was given to heavy industry, industrialisation in the national regions was usually commenced with the development of light industry, mostly the traditional branches such as ginning, fruit and vegetable processing, silkworm-breeding and carpet-weaving, etc. Irrigational facilities, motor roads, railways, and mining enterprises were also built there. These undertakings made it possible to raise the local working class

while leaving national traditions intact and to accelerate the development of industrial production.

Local conditions were particularly closely studied and taken into account during agricultural collectivisation in the outlying national regions and republics. Cooperation first began in the grain, cotton-growing and tea-growing regions where the percentage of landless peasants was especially high. In the regions where horticulture and viticulture prevailed, and where the peasants were more firmly bound to their plots of land, the pace of change was slower.

Work proceeded at a much slower pace and with greater difficulties in the nomadic livestock-breeding and extreme northern regions of the country, where life was still at the primitive stage and the inhabitants were engaged mostly in reindeer-breeding, hunting, and fishing. However, in these regions, too, rural inhabitants became actively engaged in collective labour—thanks to patient and consistent explanatory work, assistance of experts, financial aid and machinery, and—rather important—a gradual switch from the simplest forms of supply-and-marketing and credit cooperatives to primary and intermediate forms of producer cooperatives.

Changes in the cultural sphere were of great importance for the development of all nations and national minorities. In carrying out this work—organising a nation-wide drive to stamp out illiteracy and setting up schools for children—it was necessary to exercise special consideration as concerned national customs and traditions.

For many national minorities, educational work began with the creation of alphabets and written languages. In a number of these regions, co-education of males and females met opposition. Mobile schools were set up for the children of nomads, followed later by boarding schools. Private Moslem schools also functioned.

Considerable attention was paid to raising the national intelligentsia. Capable young men and women were dispatched to study in the best universities and colleges of the country. Teachers' training, medical, agricultural, and technical colleges were set up in the republics; so were universities and research centres.

Books, newspapers, and magazines published in many lan-

guages were circulated on a mass scale; theatres and film studios were established; music companies and dance groups were organised. These efforts helped restore and develop national cultures and made it possible to overcome national isolation. They also speeded up the development of a people's culture, truly national in form and socialist in content.

Industrialisation, collectivisation, and the cultural revolution gradually raised the level of the remote regions' economic and cultural development to that of the central regions. Socialist changes promoted political, economic, and cultural advancement within each nation and the development of former tribal groups into socialist nations, so that the basis of national statehood was laid. This led to the formation of new sovereign republics which voluntarily joined the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Developing within the Union, these republics could rely on the help of the entire country. Thanks to this help, backward regions have become industrially and agriculturally developed republics. Lenin's idea of the possibility for formally backward nations to pass on to socialism skipping capitalism has been confirmed by the socialist construction.

Socialism's Victory

During the first two decades after the October Revolution the building of a socialist society was, in the main, completed in the USSR. The material and technological base of socialism—a large-scale modern machine industry encompassing the entire national economy, all the regions of the country—was laid down. Considerable attention was paid to the development of branches of heavy industry. With the expanded production of tractors, harvester combines, and other machinery, agriculture also received a new technological base.

Social ownership of the means of production became the single economic foundation of the Soviet state. In the USSR, it was established in two forms. The land, its minerals, factories and plants, banks, transport, trading firms and state farms in the countryside were the national (state) property. The second form was cooperative ownership represented by kolkhozes and producer cooperatives embracing former artisans and individual

manufacturers. Both forms of ownership are socialist in character.

Socialist ownership made it possible to carry out a planned development of the entire national economy in accordance with theoretically substantiated state five-year plans. This made it easier to concentrate efforts on vital sections, to utilise material, financial, as well as labour resources more effectively and, thus achieve unprecedented production growth rates.

The ultimate purpose of socialist production, though, is not just to achieve high economic indices, but to meet the increasing material and intellectual needs of the working people. The completion of the first five-year-plan assignments made it possible to totally eliminate unemployment, reduce working hours and raise wages and salaries, as well as the incomes of agricultural workers in the kolkhozes.

"Wage-levelling"—equal remuneration for the hard worker and the lazybones—was rejected as the principle of distribution of material and cultural benefits. Distribution came to be based on the socialist principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work", meaning that those who put in more effort for the benefit of society receive more benefits from it. Skilled and industrious workers were, and are, universally respected, rewarded, elected to government bodies, appointed heads of enterprises and public organisations. This changed the workers' attitude to work, making each of them realise that conscientious work and development of socialist production are in his own interest.

The establishment of the socialist type of the public ownership of the means of production removed all possibilities of oppression, appropriation of other people's labour, and exploitation of man by man. Exploiter classes ceased to exist. Two friendly classes—the working class and the peasantry—and the intelligentsia of the worker and peasant origin constituted society's social basis.

The working class was no longer the poor and downtrodden proletariat of the pre-revolutionary period. It had been totally rid of exploitation. Its numbers had increased and its national base had broadened. It became more politically conscious and organised, and had a higher occupational and cultural level.

Socialist working class has rightly become the leading class in the Soviet Union.

Due to cooperation, the Soviet peasantry had acquired a unified social composition. Peasant political consciousness was gradually changing; there was a stronger spirit of collectivism, and the cultural level of the countryside was rising. The kolkhoz peasantry now takes an active part in the socialist construction and socio-political life of the country.

The intelligentsia was also changing. It ceased to be in the service of the bourgeoisie and landlords. It grew in numbers and its occupational qualifications rose significantly. Today, the majority of Soviet intellectuals are of worker and peasant origin, and place all their capabilities and knowledge at the service of the people, the cause of socialist construction.

The profound changes that took place in the life of the country were legislatively embodied in the 1936 Constitution of the USSR adopted after a nation-wide discussion. It declared the socialist economic system and socialist ownership of the means of production to be the economic foundation of the Soviet state.

The 1936 Constitution guaranteed each Soviet citizen the right to work, rest and leisure, education, and an old-age or disability pension. Also, it declared labour to be a duty of each citizen, obliged all citizens to safeguard and promote socialist ownership, and to observe discipline at work.

Taking into account the changes that had occurred in the country's social structure, the community of cardinal interests, as well as the enhanced moral political cohesion of the Soviet people, the Constitution proclaimed equal political rights for all citizens. It abolished limited civil rights, granting peasants the right to equal representation in the Soviets. Elections to all agencies of government authority were made general, direct, equal and secret. Democracy for the majority gave place to democracy for all.

The Constitution granted the citizens freedom of worship, speech, of the press, meetings, and association in various public organisations. At the same time, it obliged all citizens to observe the principles and laws laid down in the Constitution and to honestly fulfil their public duties. Defence of the Motherland was proclaimed the sacred duty of each Soviet citizen.

Defining the country's state structure, the Constitution stated that the USSR was a voluntary union of equal socialist republics, each exercising state power independently, possessing its own Constitution, and having the right to withdraw from the USSR. The Constitution reflected consistent internationalism, fraternal friendship and cooperation among all the nations of the USSR.

A major provision of the Constitution was the legislatively secured leadership of the Communist Party in the USSR. Embracing the more politically conscious and active representatives of the working class and other social strata, the Communist Party is guiding all the working people's organisations, governmental and public alike. This provision of the 1936 USSR Constitution reflected the nation-wide recognition of the Communists' contribution to the building of a socialist society and the 'arty's increasing role in the efforts to consolidate and advance he socialist system.

The achievements of the Soviet Union in all spheres of life ıave graphically demonstrated that all-round political, economıc, cultural and social progress is possible only in a society developing along socialist lines. Such a society came into existence in the USSR, providing the world with the first ever example of society built upon the foundations of socialism.

Chapter Four

CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH. THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM

The Epoch of Transition to Socialism

Every historical epoch of society's development is marked by certain qualitative distinctions. The major distinction is the character of an epoch. It is defined by identifying the leading class of the epoch.

In the contemporary world, mankind's development is determined by the international working class and the world socialist system. The working class leads the struggle against exploitation and oppression. The world socialist system makes the biggest contribution to the settlement of major problems facing mankind today.

Our epoch is a lengthy historical period of revolutionary transition to socialism and communism from capitalism (or semi-capitalist and pre-capitalist structures) achieved in the course of a difficult class struggle. Our epoch began with the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917, that is, when the working class assumed power in Russia, a country occupying one-sixth of our planet. It will end with the elimination of exploitation of man by man and the creation of conditions for the all-round development of personality.

The major processes of contemporary epoch are: inception and evolution of the world socialist system, successes scored by the labour movement in capitalist countries, transfer of former colonial and semi-colonial nations on to the stage of independent socio-political activity, upsurge of the anti-imperialist struggle, and emergence of new mass democratic movements. Our epoch embraces the historic competition of the two opposing social sys-

tems—socialist and capitalist—and the struggle of the principal driving forces of social development—world socialism, the working-class and communist movement, newly independent nations, and mass democratic movements—for peace, democracy and social progress, and against imperialism with its policies of aggression and oppression.

Our age is one of revolutions and movements of various types: socialist, democratic, and national liberation. They all have anti-imperialist and, in the final count, socialist orientation. A multitude of forces, including those not aimed at the elimination of capitalism and building of socialism, participate in the anti-imperialist struggle. In the capitalist countries, they set themselves the narrower objective of achieving a more just democratic order, and of solving problems of unemployment and poverty.

The objective in the newly independent countries is to eliminate the backwardness inherited from the colonial times and to develop their national economies and cultures. The planet's democratic forces are struggling to rid mankind of the threat of a new world war, to achieve detente and stop the arms race. Although their struggle has a general-democratic, not a socialist character, it is objectively directed against capitalist exploitation and the aggressive policies of imperialism. This struggle may eventually lead its participants to the only logical conclusion: the necessity of abolishing the regimes of exploitation. In our days there is no way to social progress other than through socialism.

Capitalism has become a brake on social progress. It cannot produce correct solutions to the imminent problems of social development—employment, social justice, education, health care, security in old age, development of equitable relations among nations. The imperialist strategy, aimed at suppressing the struggle of revolutionary and democratic forces and whipping up tensions, endangers the very existence of mankind.

The present correlation of forces embodies the possibility of a successful outcome of the struggle being waged by various forces for democracy, national liberation, and social progress. When a socialist country and later a group of socialist countries emerged in the world arena, it became possible to avoid war as a means of settling disputes among states.

The alignment of the major powers' military strength has ceased to be a factor deciding the fate of the world. The present correlation of forces is built up by all states, big and small, and also by mass socio-political movements. The prime reason for this is the fact that the world socialist system has invariably supported the sovereign right of all nations to decide their own destinies and to equally participate in international affairs. The collapse of imperialism's colonial system, followed by the formation of new states, has had a profound impact on the course of international development. Another factor is the current invigoration of the international communist movement, trade union, and anti-war movements, as well as the progressive anti-imperialist forces in developing countries.

At the same time, international affairs are shaped under the influence of reactionary, imperialist forces, united in fascist, terrorist, Zionist and other similar organisations.

The Contradictions of Our Age

Social progress, mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, has to overcome the desperate resistance put up by reactionary forces. That is why our age has so many contradictions: between socialism and capitalism, the forces of war and peace, imperialism and national liberation movements, revolution and counter-revolution. These are also contradictions between the possibilities inherent in scientific and technological progress and their utilisation by imperialism in its drive for superprofits, between the world level of scientific and technological progress and the technological and economic backwardness of the countries newly freed from colonial oppression, and so on and so forth.

The fundamental contradiction of our age, that between capitalism and socialism, exerts a decisive influence on the course of historical development and the settlement of international problems. It first surfaced in the form of contradiction between the capitalist countries, on the one hand, and the first socialist country (supported by working people all over the world), on the other. With the emergence of a system of socialist countries, it has assumed the form of struggle between the opposing systems—the capitalist and the socialist. It has unfolded

in all areas—economic, political, military, ideological and cultural—and encompassed the basic contradictions between labour and capital on a world scale.

Capitalism weakens as socialism consolidates its positions. Capitalism has been eradicated in countries comprising over one-third of the world population. Imperialism has lost its colonial possessions; however, it is still a strong and dangerous opponent of all progressive forces. Relying on its great military and economic power, imperialism strives to regain its positions and to thwart democratic regimes. Therefore, one must not underestimate the dangers of imperialism's aggressive policies.

Increasing importance attaches to the struggles of the working class in capitalist countries against the omnipotence of monopolies, of the forces of national liberation against imperialism's neocolonialist policies, and of the peace forces against the danger of a new war. Some of these contradictions have become acute. For instance, the national liberation movement often takes the form of armed struggle. The peace champions' opposition to the arms race and deployment of American missiles in Western Europe has intensified of late. However, in no region can the struggle of liberation and democratic forces score positive results without the decisive contribution of world socialism to the change in the correlation of forces in the world. Therefore, attempts by some revolutionaries to detach themselves from the confrontation of the two systems, from existing socialism, can only limit the potential and prospects of their own struggles.

As for the method of resolving the fundamental contradiction, that between socialism and capitalism, it does not inevitably lie in a world war. Marxist-Leninists are of the opinion that contradictions between countries with different social systems must not assume the form of military conflict, all the more so considering that today a military conflict may result in mankind's annihilation.

The socialist countries are for resolving disputes through negotiations held, undoubtedly, on the foundation of reciprocity, equal security and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Socialist countries are in favour of expanding economic, scientific, technological, political and cultural cooperation among all states and peoples. Marxist-Leninists see peaceful

coexistence of states as the only form of international relations possible in the current conditions of nuclear threat.

To be sure, the class contradictions of the two systems cannot be reconciled. Still, the forces of peace, democracy and social progress, which are stronger than the forces of reaction and war, can compel the imperialist states to adopt the policy of peaceful coexistence as the sole alternative to a nuclear holocaust.

Peaceful coexistence between the two systems covers a lengthy period, during which the correlation of forces will increasingly change in favour of socialism. In conditions of peace, the socialist countries will sooner attain higher than the capitalist countries labour productivity. The basic socialist values will be comprehensively developed, increasing socialism's revolutionising influence. In the capitalist countries, conditions will become ever more favourable for a successful struggle by the working people for new social and democratic changes, and against oppression and exploitation. It is easier for the developing countries to solve their economic, political, and social problems in conditions of peace.

Thus, the struggle for peace is closely linked with mankind's struggle for social progress. The class interests of the international working class coincide with the class interests of all progressive mankind.

The Interaction of Forces in the World Revolutionary Process

Mankind's progress, its advance towards socialism is a lengthy and fairly contradictory process. Transition to socialism does not occur by capitalism or pre-capitalist relations spontaneously growing over into socialism. Socialism cannot be attained through reforms or achievements of the scientific and technological revolution.

The contemporary revolutionary process has a worldwide character. Before 1917 the revolutionary process embraced a considerable number of independently rising proletarian, peasant, general-democratic, and national liberation movements and revolutions, most of which were spontaneous. It was only when the working class emerged in the arena of the class struggle that the revolutionary process began to acquire its

present global character. The 1917 socialist revolution in Russia spurred on revolutionary movements on all continents.

The current revolutionary process is also extremely heterogeneous. It is made up of diverse social forces: the working class, peasantry, urban and rural petty bourgeoisie, and the broad strata of intelligentsia. The development of social progress is influenced by all participants in the struggle against the more reactionary circles of imperialism: some of the national bourgeoisie in the countries dependent on imperialism and that section of the bourgeoisie in industrialised capitalist countries which opposes the arms race and wars of aggression. The social aims and approaches to social problems vary from group to group. Most of the participants in mass democratic movements fight for general-democratic goals. They oppose imperialist policies without linking their own struggle with the prospect of socialism.

Notwithstanding the immediate goals of its participants, the struggle has a progressive character and a general anti-imperialist thrust. All contributors to social progress weaken imperialism, undermine its foundations and thwart its plans, thus creating opportunities for achieving ever more profound and, ultimately, cardinal changes in society.

This is not to say, though, that the world revolutionary process is a strictly onward, straightforward and smooth march. Its evolution is complicated and uneven. Revolutionary forces have to cope with great difficulties in the fight for their interests. Fairly often they have to defend themselves, retreat, suffer defeats, and then summon up strength and intensify the struggle again. It could not be otherwise in the struggle of the new against the old. All the more so considering that today the struggle is waged against a seasoned, strong and skilful enemy. In its onslaught against revolutionary forces imperialism resorts to armed force, subversion, economic sanctions, and ideological campaigns. It strives to preserve the exploiter system and to slow down mankind's progress at any cost. To achieve this purpose, imperialism flagrantly violates the universally recognised principles of international relations, interfering in sovereign states' internal affairs and undermining democratic regimes and liberation movements through the use of military force.

However, notwithstanding the bitter resistance offered by

imperialism, ever new forces join the struggle for peace, democracy, and national independence.

The multitude of movements comprising the current revolutionary process falls into three basic revolutionary forces: the world socialist system, the working-class movement in capitalist countries, and the national liberation movement.

Socialist nations are the leading force of the world revolutionary process, since they implement the objectives determining the future of all mankind. They are building and improving a society without exploiters; a society of social justice where each person is valued in accordance with his or her work regardless of sex, age, or nationality, where each person is given every opportunity for satisfying his material and spiritual needs.

The revolutionary struggle waged by the working class of industrialised capitalist countries is of particular importance because the ruling classes of these countries constitute the bulwark of world reaction. At their disposal are huge economic and military resources. The working class of these countries wages its struggle in the very centre of imperialism. Therefore, the struggle of the working class and other democratic forces against the reactionary policies of monopolies and for democratic domestic and foreign policies promotes not only the interests of their own nations but also those of all progressive forces of the world.

Fighting for political and economic independence, elimination of the backwardness inherited from colonialism, and social progress, the working people of newly independent nations undermine the positions of imperialism and the exploiting classes in their own countries. This has rendered it impossible for imperialism to hold undivided sway, as it used to, over the labour and raw material resources of these countries for increasing its power and implementing its aggressive designs. The newly independent countries had and still have a major role to play in bringing about changes in the correlation of forces in the world. They vigorously contribute to the struggle for peace and against the aggressive designs of imperialism in various regions of the world.

The fourth major driving force of social development are mass democratic movements. Objectively opposed to reactionary imperialist circles, they form part of the mainspring

in the struggle for peace and social progress.

The four major components of the world revolutionary process are objectively interrelated and exert great influence on each other.

World socialism is the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle. The successes scored by socialism thwart imperialism's aggressive designs. The changes in the correlation of forces in favour of socialism make it possible for the working people of capitalist countries to effectively search for their own way to socialism. The example set by socialism in tackling major social problems revolutionises the working people in capitalist countries and makes it easier for them to put forth far-reaching demands; hence the bourgeoisie is often impelled to agree to more changes than it would like.

Socialism's successes create more favourable international conditions for the national liberation struggle. They impede imperialism's export of counter-revolution and its effort to suppress the struggle for independence waged by the countries which have liberated themselves from colonial domination. As socialism gains firmer ground, it renders more economic, cultural and other assistance to newly independent countries. It is easier for these countries to look for more effective methods of strengthening national sovereignty, overcoming backwardness and attaining social progress by learning from the experience of socialist countries. The existence of the world socialist system facilitates newly independent countries' transition to socialism skipping the capitalist stage of development.

By their fight for democratic foreign policies to be pursued by their countries, peaceful coexistence, and a New International Economic Order, the working-class and democratic movements of the capitalist countries create foreign-policy conditions more favourable for an effective solution of the tasks facing the socialist and newly free nations. The working class of the capitalist countries lends active support for the socialist countries' approach to international relations. The solidarity of the working-class movement with the forces of national liberation was and is an essential component of the successes scored by the national liberation movement.

In turn, the successes of the newly independent countries in the struggle against imperialism and in the effort to attain

political and economic independence and eliminate the backwardness inherited from colonialism, weaken imperialism. These countries' vigorous activities in the world arena and participation in international and regional organisations and movements have a resounding political effect. The successes scored by mass-scale democratic movements facilitate the struggle of all revolutionary forces and expand their social base.

Existing socialism is a major factor of our times. A precise and objective understanding of its place in the world is of fundamental importance if a correct approach to all social problems is to be found.

The USSR Today

The building of socialism in the USSR proceeded in a complicated international situation. The defeat suffered by foreign intervention, described in the preceding chapter, did not have a sobering effect on the imperialist aggressors. The Soviet Union had to go through a terrible ordeal—the Great Patriotic War against Nazi Germany and its allies—from 1941 to 1945.

Long and sanguinary, the Great Patriotic War lasted 1,418 days and took a toll of 20 million human lives.

The Soviet Union achieved military, political, and economic victory over the enemies of the socialist Motherland. It strengthened even more the firm alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and also friendship among all Soviet nations.

It was a victory of the socialist ideology that proved its superiority over the fascist ideology.

The Soviet people not only defended their own country but liberated European nations from the fascist occupation, rendered enormous assistance to China and other Asian nations in their struggle against Japanese militarism, and, in fact, rid the world of the threat of Nazi enslavement.

The Soviet Union has achieved impressive progress in the postwar decades. The country's economy has made rapid strides reflected in the growing scale of industrial and agricultural production. Considering the fact that the country's population has increased by one-third over the period in question, one can see that the per capita industrial and agricultural output has grown immensely.

The qualitatively new level of development reached by socialism's productive forces is testified to by the development and expansion of modern branches of the national economy. The Soviet Union opened the road into outer space when it launched the first artificial Earth satellite. The first cosmonaut was a Soviet citizen. Particularly impressive are the Soviet Union's achievements in the peaceful utilisation of outer space. This is reflected not only in modern rocket- and instrument-making but also in the emergence of totally new directions in the development of space science and technology: radio, television, medicine, biology, astronomy, etc. The Soviet Union willingly shares its experience and knowledge with other countries. Cosmonauts of a number of socialist states, France, and India have made space flights aboard Soviet spaceships.

Contemporary development of the Soviet national economy is distinguished by its evening out throughout all republics and economic regions, by its intertwining development and merger into a single national economic complex. The Soviet economy today is not a sum total of regional economies but a uniform economic system built upon stable economic ties and community of goals and interests; it is developing in accordance with a single social and economic development plan.

Socialist social relations have become permanent and stable. The socialist state of the whole people represents the interests of the entire Soviet people. This is not to say that the socialist state has ceased to be the agent of the working-class policy and Marxist-Leninist ideology. The fact is that the working class's historical mission, as well as its political and economic interests, have acquired a nation-wide character. The Soviet people is unanimous in its desire to strengthen socialism and build communism.

The Soviet Union's successes in socialist construction are impressive indeed. It does not mean, however, that problems and difficulties are totally non-existent. The country has yet to achieve certain major objectives and overcome considerable difficulties in its advance towards communism. As was stressed at the 27th Party Congress in 1986, developed socialism is a lengthy stage in the historic period of gradual transition from socialism to communism. The Soviet Union is now at the beginning of this period.

The CPSU warns against unwarranted anticipation or underestimation of the obtaining difficulties and shortcomings. They are caused primarily by an array of objective factors impeding, as before, the evolution of the new society. Among them are the low level of economic and cultural development at the early stage of socialist construction, lack of experience and knowledge of those who, for the first time in the history of mankind, got down to build a socialist society, as well as the need to allocate substantial resources for defence due to the growing threat from the most reactionary forces of the old world. Besides, the evolution of the new is impeded by miscalculations and errors in the organisation of socialist construction, and also by some individuals in Soviet society who still show inadequate level of political consciousness. By adhering to revolutionary principles and self-criticism and relying on the support of the people, the CPSU does a great job in correcting its own mistakes.

At its 27th Congress the Communist Party of the Soviet Union drew up a programme of accelerating the socio-economic development of Soviet society. The basic objectives are to advance the national economy, people's welfare and quality of life; improve the entire system of social relationships (extend and strengthen socialist democracy and establish new forms of rule by the people); further strengthen friendship among all nations and ethnic groups, and promote the population's cultural and intellectual development as well as their spiritual education in line with communist morality.

The Strategy of Acceleration

An all-round progress of Soviet society and its advance towards communism can and must be ensured through acceleration of the country's socio-economic development. The course of acceleration implies profound changes in all spheres of life.

In the economic sphere, it means raising the national economy to a new scientific, technological, economic, and organisational level, and attaining higher labour productivity and quality of output.

At the initial stage of socialism, a growth in industrial production was attained chiefly by building new enterprises

and creating new jobs. This type of economic development is called extensive. Presently, it has ceased to be effective. Nowadays, it is necessary to increase production at the enterprises currently operating—i.e., shift to the intensive way of economic development. Production intensification presupposes emphasis laid on the growth of labour productivity, effective utilisation of enterprises' productive capacities, utmost economy of material, financial, and labour resources, and higher product and labour quality.

A switch-over to the intensive type of production development is impossible without improvements in the system of management and the entire economic mechanism. The system of economic management which existed until recently ensured quantitative indices of economic growth. The new system of management stimulates primarily qualitative indices of economic growth. For this purpose, planning is improved and new forms of labour organisation are introduced, notably the team form which has proved efficient. The latter is a type of labour organisation whereby all team members work according to a single plan and are paid collectively by the end results. Distribution of tasks within the team depends on the common decision of all the team members. A team meeting discusses the labour input of each member and decides upon his or her remuneration. Therefore, the team form of labour organisation and incentives is a significant manifestation of socialist production democracy.

To accelerate the development of the social sphere means to work for improvement in the people's well-being; to create a practically classless society, a society without marked socio-economic and cultural distinctions between town and countryside, in which physical and mental labour are ever more intimately linked in productive activities; to achieve greater cohesion of the Soviet people; and to advance the masses' creative power and initiative.

In the political sphere, accelerated development of Soviet society signifies extension of socialist self-government through an ever greater involvement of citizens in the management of state and social affairs; improvements in the electoral system; better performance of the elective agencies of the people's rule; elevation of the role of youth, women's and other public

organisations; effective utilisation of all forms of representative and direct democracy.

Advancement of socialist democracy is linked, first of all, with the development of production democracy, which essentially amounts to the working people's legal right to and actual participation in the management of enterprises. As stipulated in the USSR Constitution adopted in 1977, a work collective is the basic cell of socialist society, vested with many rights. The Supreme Soviet of the USSR has adopted a law On Work Collectives, which extends workers' control over the managerial staff, distribution of social funds, organisation of labour, and moral and material work incentives. Work collectives now take an ever greater part in the drawing of socio-economic development plans for their particular enterprises and the organisation of control over their implementation.

The Soviets of People's Deputies constitute the political foundation of the USSR. A broad network of People's Control groups, attached to the Soviets, supervises the performance of management bodies and officials. There are also numerous commissions functioning under the Soviets of People's Deputies (children's commissions, housing distribution and other commissions), involving several million people working on a voluntary basis.

Further improvement and strengthening of the Communist Party's role is the decisive condition for perfecting socialist democracy. The CPSU is the nucleus of the Soviet political system, Soviet society's guiding and leading force. Broader socialist democracy means that inner-Party democracy will be strengthened, that is, Communists will ever more effectively contribute to the development of the Party's political line upon *uskoreniye*—acceleration of socialism's socio-political development. Communists will also have a greater role to play in the work of the Soviets of People's Deputies and all public organisations. The strengthening of the Party's leading role, far from contradicting the objective of improving and advancing socialist democracy, is in fact its indispensable condition. The interests of the Party and the people coincide, the CPSU has no other goal than to promote the interests of the working people. Therefore, the strengthening of the Party's leading role is necessary if the operation of the Soviets is to be improved, the sluggish

attitude of individual deputies overcome, elements of red tape eradicated, working people's participation in the Soviets enhanced and the Soviets' ties with the masses consolidated.

Public organisations have a major role to play in advancing socialist democracy. Trade unions—the biggest public organisations—embrace practically the entire adult population.

Socialism's moral principles, the spirit of collectivism and comradely assistance, are increasingly inculcated in the life of society. Broad masses of the population are daily introduced to ever more scientific achievements and cultural values.

The USSR is a country with the world's highest level of education. As was mentioned earlier in this book, the compulsory term of schooling is 10 years. There are numerous institutions of higher learning. Students of universities, institutes and technical secondary schools receive state grants. There is also an extended network of political and technical courses at enterprises and offices, as well as People's Universities designed to heighten the working people's cultural level. The total body of students is about 120 million, that is, half of the Soviet population.

The Party and the government pay appropriate attention to improving the educational system. The reform of school and university education, the laws on which were adopted in 1984 and 1986, is designed to raise the quality of instruction in all educational establishments.

Further advancement of socialism requires a rise of the Soviet people's cultural standard as an essential component of their harmonious development. Literature and arts play a great role in heightening the people's cultural level, in their moral and aesthetic education. At the current stage, literature and arts play an ever greater part in the shaping of Marxist-Leninist outlook and significantly contribute to the satisfaction of the Soviet people's diverse cultural demands. The satisfaction of cultural needs and the rise of the cultural standard are ensured by the world's widest network of public libraries, community centres, clubs, theatres, and museums, placed fully at the disposal of Soviet people. The Soviet Union has long outstripped all other countries as concerns the number and circulation of periodicals, the annual output of books as well as theatre and cinema attendance.

To ensure a harmonious development of personality, it is necessary to create the most favourable conditions for physical, intellectual, moral and ethical improvement; in short, to create a new—communist—civilisation. It will be a community of happy, well-to-do, intellectually refined and physically fit people.

The Community of Socialist States

Socialist revolutions that began in some East European countries towards the end of World War II when final defeat was inflicted on German Nazism, triumphed in 1949. By that time internal counter-revolution had been crushed and the attempts to restore the domination of landowners and capitalists curbed. Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia took the path of socialist construction. The German Democratic Republic—the first worker and peasant state in Germany—was proclaimed in 1949. The world socialist system, initiated by the Soviet Union and Mongolia, thus emerged.

The second major event in the post-war development of the world revolutionary process was the beginning of socialist construction in some Asian countries. The defeat of militarist Japan in 1945, when Korea was liberated from Japanese occupation and the Soviet Army routed Japan's Kwantung Army, encouraged an upsurge of the national liberation and revolutionary movements in Korea and China. The formation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was proclaimed in 1948. In the difficult war of 1950-1953 against American imperialism, Korean people were able to safeguard the gains of the revolution in the north of the country, and got down to building socialism. The Chinese People's Republic was formed in 1949. The triumph of the revolution in China and the country's choice of the socialist way of development greatly strengthened the world socialist system.

The Vietnamese people had to wage a difficult and stubborn struggle. The August 1945 Revolution ended the French colonial rule, and the formation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam was proclaimed. French imperialists launched a colonial war—which continued until 1954—against the people of Vietnam. The Vietnamese people managed to protect its revolutionary gains in the

north of the country, while the south remained under French occupation and later came under US domination. The South Vietnamese puppet regime and US imperialists launched a fierce war against the Vietnamese people in that part of the country. Relying on the assistance rendered by socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union, the heroic Vietnamese people dealt US imperialism a crushing blow in 1976. Subsequently, a united and consolidated Socialist Republic of Vietnam was formed to become a component part of the world socialist system. Laos, too, embarked on the road of socialist construction after the defeat of French and US imperialists.

Thus, the world socialist system was joined by four Asian countries: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

The Republic of Cuba is the first socialist state on the American continent. The Cuban revolution has greatly influenced the toiling masses in Latin American countries. That is why socialist construction in Cuba has encountered fierce resistance on the part of American imperialism. The US has launched extensive subversive activities against revolutionary Cuba. Still, in spite of all the measures taken by US imperialism, the Republic of Cuba has been firmly advancing along the road of socialism.

Socialism's growth into a world system is a logical result of socio-political development. The objective foundation for the unity of all the countries within the world socialist system is characterised by public ownership of the basic means of production, relations based on cooperation and mutual assistance of people free from exploitation, a socialist form of the government authority, and Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The socialist countries maintain the new—socialist—type of inter-state relations, based on socialist internationalism. The principal features of this type of relations are: total equality, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, cooperation, and mutual assistance. Such inter-state relations are completely different from those of the capitalist type, since the latter are determined by the struggle for spheres of influence and a craving to enslave developing nations. Economic expansion—the drive for economic and political domina-

tion over other nations—is alien to socialism.

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) was set up in 1949 to regulate foreign economic relations of the socialist community of nations. Later, the Bank for Economic Cooperation and the International Investment Bank were set up under the Council, to handle economic and financial matters and also provide credits for the development of the socialist countries' national economies.

An international socialist division of labour and a world socialist market have developed within the community of socialist states. The principal forms of economic endeavour include cooperation in the field of science and technology, trade, personnel training, and exchange of know-how. The socio-economic plans of individual countries are coordinated, and the socialist countries gradually switch over to the drawing of joint plans for the development of industries and enterprises.

The highest form of international cooperation today is socialist economic integration: a planned process of linking the economies of socialist countries on the basis of division of labour, formation of a highly effective economic development, gradual levelling out of the countries' economic development, and maintenance of firm and stable ties among industries and branches of these countries' economies. The purpose of socialist integration is the utmost utilisation of each country's potential and advantages of the international socialist division of labour. Socialist economic integration ensures a rapid and effective economic growth, benefits all socialist countries, and promotes the interests of the socialist community as a whole. The advantages of this type of economic policy and international division of labour have made the socialist community the most dynamic and rapidly developing group of countries in the world.

The Common Features of Socialist Construction

Experience gained in the revolutionary transformation of society has shown that, no matter in which country a socialist revolution occurs, its principal features are the same. It is these features that determine the essence and socio-class content of the revolution. The basic ones are:

—leadership by the working class and a Marxist-Leninist

party of the toiling masses in effecting a socialist revolution and building a classless society;

—alliance of the working class with the peasantry and other sections of the working people;

—elimination of capitalist ownership and introduction of public ownership of the basic means of production;

—gradual transformation of agriculture along socialist lines;

—planned development of the national economy aimed at raising the working people's standard of living;

—implementation of a socialist revolution in the spheres of ideology and culture and the bringing up of a stratum of intelligentsia loyal to the cause of socialism;

—equality and fraternal friendship among nations;

—defence of socialist gains against encroachments by internal and external enemies;

—solidarity of the working people of each country with the struggle waged by all the working people for a new society.

These general regularities do not exclude the existence of features peculiar to each country building socialism. The existence of specific features is explained by the different conditions obtaining in the countries that have embarked on the road of socialism, notably, the level of socio-economic development; national character, mode of life, customs and traditions; geographical position and natural and climatic conditions; international situation, and other factors. All these differ from country to country and leave their specific imprint on the process of socialist construction.

The Communist and Workers' parties of the countries building socialism take into account the common features as well as the national distinctions. Lenin's plan for building socialism is being steadily implemented in all the countries within the socialist community. The Soviet Union's experience is not simply copied in the process but is creatively applied to suit the conditions obtaining in each country. In the course of socialist construction the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries make tangible contributions to the theory and practice of socialism, and their experience is placed at the disposal of all the revolutionary forces of the world.

The peculiarities of each socialist country's political system are, to a large extent, determined by the ways and methods

of implementing the socialist revolution. Government by the working people is a feature common for all the socialist countries. However, some have a one-party system, and others—a bloc of progressive and democratic parties actively involved in the building of socialism under the guidance of a Marxist-Leninist party.

Revolutionary socio-economic transformations were also carried out differently in various countries. Of all the socialist countries, land was nationalised in Mongolia and the USSR. Agrarian reforms gave the greater part of the land expropriated from the landlords and big capitalists to small landowners and large peasant families. The process of expropriation was also peculiar to each country. In the majority of countries, nationalisation of the basic means of production took quite a long time; in some cases, former owners were partially compensated for loss of property.

Following the victory of the revolution, the industrialised countries were faced with the task of further developing the material and technological base left over from the past, building the economic structures appropriate to socialism, and developing modern industries based upon the latest technologies.

The primary socio-economic objective of the countries of low or zero level of industrial development was socialist industrialisation. Presently as before, industrialisation in some countries is carried out with priority development of the light and extractive industries; in others, through a parallel development of the light and heavy industries. Employing the advantages of the international socialist division of labour, each country is developing the industries for which it has the most favourable conditions. The cohesion of socialist countries is an important security factor for each country and the community as a whole. Thus, the existence of the world socialist system greatly fosters and facilitates the process of setting up a material and technological base.

The socialist countries have made a major contribution to the theory and practice of agricultural cooperation.

The fact that in the majority of countries the land was not nationalised has, to a considerable extent, shaped the peculiarities of agricultural cooperation in these countries. Collective

farms were set up only on that part of the land which became the property of the state.

Peasant private ownership of the land shaped the methods of implementing socialist changes in the countryside and the forms of producer cooperatives. The principles of voluntariness and material incentives dictated the need to compensate the peasants for the means of production, land, and livestock they submitted to cooperatives. Without this it would have been difficult to draw in well-to-do peasants in cooperatives, and, hence, the entire process of agricultural cooperation could have been hampered.

Another major distinction of agricultural cooperation determined by the prevalence of private ownership of land were cooperatives of the semi-socialist type. In such cooperatives incomes are distributed among the members in accordance with the work done and also the size of land handed in. Initially, the land remains the private property of cooperative members. Only land-use is socialised, i.e., the land is cultivated collectively and its output is the property of the cooperative. Apart from the portion earned through his labour input, a landowner has additional income which is determined by the size and quality of his plot of land.

The conversion of an intermediate cooperative into a higher type is effected through compensation payments made over the years to former landowners. When all payments have been made, the land is turned into cooperative property. After that, incomes are distributed solely according to labour inputs.

With time the world socialist system has become a major factor of historical evolution and the most powerful force of our day, due to the successes it has achieved in its socio-economic development.

Chapter Five

THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM. THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT IN CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

The Distinguishing Features of the Crisis

In recent decades the capitalist world has found itself in a state of general crisis. A gradual crumbling of capitalism as a social system is taking place. Imperialism stubbornly resists the forces of social progress. Occasionally, it launches counter-attacks which cannot, however, change the principal trend of current historical development—mankind's advance towards socialism.

Elimination of the capitalist system in an ever greater number of states and the ensuing split of the world into two opposing social systems—the capitalist and the socialist—is the main manifestation of the general crisis of capitalism.

Other features are the emergence of state-monopoly capitalism and the unprecedented growth of militarism, which have gravely exacerbated the contradictions of the capitalist system. The general crisis is also seen in an increasingly unstable and contradictory development of the capitalist economy. Political instability is becoming more acute and the struggle between labour and capital is intensifying.

The general crisis of capitalism has also made itself felt in bourgeois ideology, is seen in its inability to find solutions to urgent contemporary problems.

The October Revolution in Russia was followed by an upsurge of revolutionary movements in industrialised capitalist states and of national liberation movements in the colonies and dependencies. That was the beginning of the crisis of imperialism's colonial system. The capitalist economy began to lose stability. From 1929 to 1933, the capitalist countries found themselves in a state of a most profound economic crisis.

The class struggle of the toiling masses was becoming more acute. In a number of capitalist countries the reactionaries resorted to an open offensive against the working class. Fascist regimes were established in Italy and Germany.

The general crisis of capitalism manifested itself in the course of World War II and socialist revolutions that occurred in a number of European and Asian countries. Socialism went beyond the boundaries of one country to become a world system.

The collapse of imperialism's colonial system and growing instability of the capitalist economy were a major testimony to the deepening crisis of capitalism. Monopoly capitalism grew into state-monopoly capitalism and merged with militarist forces.

Cardinal changes in favour of socialism have taken place in the correlation of forces of the two opposing systems in the current conditions of the general crisis of capitalism.

As is pointed out in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress, the general crisis of capitalism is aggravating. The conflict between the gigantic scale of the productive forces and the private-ownership character of social relations is growing ever more acute under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution. This has found expression in the massive growth of unemployment, instability of the capitalist economy, and militarism. The entire range of social problems is exacerbating, and the crisis of political institutions is worsening, along with the spiritual crisis. The stifling pressure of reaction is increasing in all spheres.

Capitalism has to cope with unprecedentedly exacerbated external and internal contradictions. Hence the reactionary circles desire to step up the arms race, impede the development of newly independent states, and provoke local wars. Ideological subversion is expanding. Anti-communism and anti-Sovietism constitute the core of this type of activity.

The Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Bourgeois World

The second half of the 20th century is distinguished by a revolution in science and technology, a marked tendency towards rapid technological growth. However, in capitalist

societies the gap between the immense possibilities created by modern science and technology, and the practical utilisation of these possibilities in the interests of society is widening. In the capitalist countries, the advantages of scientific and technological progress are used primarily to produce weapons of mass destruction.

Today, the main directions of the scientific and technological revolution (STR) are: computerisation of production, extensive use of robots and other computer and information technologies, creation of materials with pre-set properties, utilisation of new sources of energy, progress in space hardware, rapid advance of biology and the ensuing development of biotechnology, etc. One of the STR's characteristic features is the leading role of science in the development of social production and its increasing conversion into an immediate productive force.

In the process of the scientific and technological revolution, the character of labour undergoes certain changes, a higher level of skills is demanded of workers, and conditions are created for a great leap in labour productivity.

Utilisation of STR achievements promotes the socialisation of production and creates material conditions for a transition to socialism. However, progressive process in the development of productive forces are restricted by the narrow boundaries of capitalist relations of production. As a result, all capitalist contradictions grow more acute.

The STR exerts a contradictory influence on the working people of capitalist countries. It has some beneficiary effects, e.g. better food and services, a rise in the overall cultural level of the working people. At the same time, utilisation of scientific and technological achievements enhances the exploitation of the working class by raising labour intensification. As a result monopoly profits grow immensely. The use of STR achievements has also gravely exacerbated the problem of employment.

The scientific and technological revolution demands of workers a higher general educational standard and better occupational training. However, it is not in the interests of monopolies and the bourgeois governments to increase the budgets for education, so the working class has to fight for the

opportunity to receive a better training and acquire new skills.

Other negative consequences of the STR under capitalism are environmental pollution and the plundering of natural resources. Democratic circles and Communists put forth alternative programmes for preserving nature.

The Onslaught on the Working People's Rights

The development of capitalist society in the 1970s and 1980s has laid bare its cardinal opposition to the interests of the popular masses and shown that the integrated mechanism of monopolies and the bourgeois state is the main brake on mankind's progress. This is partly evident from the fact that the policy of concessions to the working class (the so-called social manoeuvring has been increasingly abandoned in favour of a direct onslaught on the rights and gains of the working people). One characteristic feature of this course is a considerable drop in government expenditures on social needs and a sharp rise in arms spendings. Directly or indirectly, it encroaches on the interests of the majority of the capitalist countries' population.

The militarist trend and the growth of transnational corporations have been especially prominent in the capitalist countries in recent years.

Militarism is a system of economic, political, ideological, and direct military undertakings by aggressive imperialist states aimed at rallying forces and means for the preparation and conduct of imperialist wars. Militarism has always been aimed at suppressing the working-class movement, enslaving the colonial and less developed nations, and also at resolving conflicts between states through wars. Today, its main thrust is directed against socialism, and its aim is to preserve and strengthen the capitalist system.

In the current conditions of state-monopoly capitalism, military-industrial complexes have appeared in a number of countries. They are composed of military monopolies, the reactionary top brass, highly placed government officials, military researchers and ideologues of capitalist states. They have been playing an ever greater role in the domestic and foreign policies of capitalist countries. Military expenditure is on the rise, and military production has become a biggest branch

of capitalist economy, consuming huge material and labour resources.

Through military loans, increased rates of taxation, and emission of additional note supply, the bourgeois state mobilises the bigger portion of the national income and channels it into war preparations. In the major imperialist countries, direct military expenditures consume half of the national budgets.

Prices of military products are set by military concerns. Military-industrial monopolies procure materials and equipment at reduced prices and engage the services of government enterprises at low costs, while selling their products to the government at monopoly-high prices. A bourgeois state reduces tax rates on the profits of military-industrial corporations, grants them credits on favourable terms and offers them other advantages. The result is that military-industrial monopolies rake in mammoth superprofits.

To justify militarism, bourgeois economists declare the arms race a means for achieving economic growth and increasing employment. But, as is well known, military production turns out neither means of production for industry nor consumer goods for the population. Military production adds nothing to, but rather eats up a portion of, the social product. In economic terms, war and military production incur totally unproductive expenditure of a good portion of the national wealth. Huge production facilities, large tracts of land, valuable and scarce raw materials (diverted from the sphere of civil economy), energy and other material resources are used for military purposes. The eight hundred billion dollars annually consumed by the arms race show that productive forces are wasted on a grand scale due to the militarisation of the capitalist countries.

Militarisation exacerbates all the problems in the capitalist economy. It widens the gap between military and civil industries; military expenditure puts a great burden on the working people, increases tax rates and raises prices.

Because of the arms race the military industry consumes immense intellectual resources. Achievements of the scientific and technological revolution are not used for the benefit of the people but for producing nuclear and other mass annihilation weapons of unprecedented destructive power.

Nuclear disaster must be prevented; this requires great endeavours by all progressive forces fighting for peace and social progress.

Intra-Imperialist Contradictions

Since the 1970s, imperialist states, transnational corporations and banks have been demonstrating a tendency for closer cooperation, setting up special organisations (the International Monetary Fund, Trilateral Commission, etc.) to coordinate their efforts. The existing system of domination by the financial oligarchy considerably tells on the lives of many millions of people in the capitalist world.

Transnational corporations act as imperialism's shock force towards the developing states. Their operations increase the developing countries' financial, technological, economic, military, and political dependence on imperialist states. They seek to split the international working class, isolate its various contingents, and set off the aggregate power of the integrated transnational system against certain national trade unions. Reactionary social policies of multinational monopolies are geared towards these purposes. They employ various methods in their fight against the working people, among them investment of capital in countries with lower wages, tax rates, and social benefits. To defeat the trade unions, transnational corporations transfer production, shut down factories, or terminate capital investments.

The development of multinational monopolies cannot eliminate intra-imperialist contradictions. Rather, in the new conditions the intra-imperialist competition is intensifying on all fronts: in commerce, export of capital, the fight for sources of raw materials, and in the sphere of international monetary relations.

Imperialist competition is graphically demonstrated by the craving of US transnational corporations to dominate the economies of Western Europe, Japan and other regions. Their efforts meet with increasing resistance. It is quite logical, inasmuch as the domination of transnational capital would contradict the national interests of any state.

The Working-Class Movement Grows

The capitalist countries have an active and growing working class (currently, 250 million strong), playing a leading role in the struggle for social progress. It has amassed a rich experience of class struggle involving wide sections of non-proletarian democratic forces. The successes scored by the working class have been primarily due to the influence of Communist parties. In a number of countries, Communist parties play the leading role in organising the struggle of the working people and in the efforts to solve the problems facing the working-class movement.

The working class comprises the majority of population in all developed capitalist countries. It has won extensive socio-economic and political rights in the course of its struggle against the bourgeoisie. However, it is now opposed by a strong and seasoned enemy—the monopoly bourgeoisie. The strategy and tactics of monopoly capital combine direct suppression of the working-class movement with attempts to integrate it in the mechanism of state-monopoly capitalism concealed by a democratic façade. The working-class movement is geared to struggle against the most developed and sophisticated system of exploitation in capitalist countries. Hence the significance and difficulties of the working-class struggle in these countries.

Exploiting the advantages of the scientific and technological revolution and state regulation methods in its own selfish interests, the monopoly bourgeoisie strives to bolster capitalism. At the same time, it tries to impress upon workers that the rather high living standards achieved in these countries testify to the changed character of capitalism and to the fact that the capitalist countries are becoming states of "general welfare".

This impedes the development of political awareness in the working class and its allies, and the operation of Communist parties in these countries. However, the growth of the working-class movement in the face of the ever intensifying contradictions of capitalism cannot be abated. Capitalism tries to solve its difficulties at the working people's expense.

Attempts by the ruling circles in the capitalist countries to shift the burden of crisis upheavals onto the shoulders of the working people have intensified the class struggle in the

1980s. A major issue of this struggle is the problem of employment caused largely by the new stage in the scientific and technological revolution. Today, unemployment induces moral as well as material ruin; an unemployed person easily loses heart, his social relationships are destroyed. The pressure of the huge "reserve army" of labour weakens the working-class positions; some workers lose confidence in the future, some are made to adopt defensive positions.

Notwithstanding all these difficulties, capital's massive offensive against the working people meets with determined resistance. The strike movement is not to be cowed.

The forms of strike include work stoppages, token strikes, seizure of the shut-down enterprises. Ever new contingents of the industrial proletariat and office workers are involved in the strike movement. When negotiations on the signing of collective agreements are conducted, workers put forward demands concerning not only employment and fringe benefits but also the working people's participation in management.

Demonstrations have become increasingly political in character. Working people's protests and manifestations against government plans to economise on social allocations have been acquiring a mass character. Workers are demanding national democratic reforms. Anti-war movements are gathering strength everywhere.

Trade unions lead the working people's drive to maintain their gains and thwart the capitalists' unpopular policies. In view of the growing military threat, the demands put forward by the trade unions which adhere to a more consistent class position as regards the protection of workers' interests acquire an increasingly political character. This is, for example, manifest in the "Jobs, Not Missiles!" slogan. The trade unions explain to the working people the direct connection between the arms race, on the one hand, and the problems of unemployment, inflation and social budget cuts, on the other. They make more and more attempts to interfere in investment policies, and fight for adoption of laws prohibiting uncontrolled closures of industrial enterprises and export of capital.

In the face of intensified class struggle and invigorated trade unions, the entrepreneurs exert pressure on trade unions in an attempt to restrict their rights and activity. There have

been attempts to make trade unions renounce the fight for higher wages, agree to longer working hours and to limited participation in enterprise management. Anti-strike legislative measures are applied. Police and various means of armed coercion are constantly used in the war on trade unions.

Therefore, the trade unions are faced with the complicated task of expanding the scope and searching for new methods of struggle against the monopolist state.

The struggle waged by the working class in capitalist countries influences all aspects of these countries' economic and political development, as well as the processes occurring in other regions of the world. They influence, in particular, the national liberation movement.

Chapter Six

ANTI-IMPERIALIST EMANCIPATORY STRUGGLE

One of the most shameful periods in the history of capitalism is the lengthy period of colonial exploitation.

Colonialism and Neocolonialism

The History of Colonialism and Its Crisis

The seizure and colonisation of foreign lands began as far back as the 15th-16th centuries. At the close of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, vast regions of the world were turned into colonies or semi-colonies.

In the colonies, the capitalist countries obtained raw materials needed for the metropolies' industrial development and marketed industrial goods at a huge profit. The colonies also proved a fertile ground for capital investment, since labour was cheap there.

Having established their domination, the imperialists developed in these countries industries needed by metropolies. The colonies were made the metropolies' agrarian and raw material appendages. The colonised nations could not accept this. Thus developed one of the most profound contradictions of our age, that between the struggle for national liberation of the colonised and dependent peoples, on the one hand, and imperialism, on the other.

The emancipatory struggle of Eastern peoples originated as far back as in the 18th and 19th centuries (the 1857 Sepoy Rebellion in India, the 1850 Taiping Rebellion in China, etc.).

Under imperialism, the national liberation struggle assumes

an anti-imperialist character since, like the working-class struggle, it is directed against the capitalist system. Its cardinally new character manifested itself in the mass national liberation movements of 1918-1920, which sprang under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

In 1917, when the peoples of Russia overthrew tsarism and thus provided an example of emancipatory struggle against oppressors, the colonial peoples' national awareness enhanced. In 1919, Afghanistan won independence and was followed by Turkey and Iran. Soviet Russia was the first country to recognise their independence and to render them appropriate material assistance.

The unprecedented wave of the anti-colonial emancipatory struggle, the emergence of working-class movements in colonial and dependent countries, the upsurge of organised trade union and communist movements and their growing impact on the national liberation struggle initiated the crisis of imperialism's colonial system.

The victory of the USSR and its allies over Nazi Germany and militarist Japan in World War II, the defeat suffered by the most reactionary forces of imperialism, and the formation of the world socialist system changed the correlation of forces in the world arena in favour of the forces of peace, democracy, and socialism.

The colonial system of imperialism began to collapse after World War II. As a result, many colonial peoples won independence, and imperialism can no longer maintain direct political control over them. In some of the former colonies, imperialism lost major economic positions as well.

However, the collapse of imperialism's colonial system did not mean that monopolies had ceased to exploit the peoples of the former colonies or that imperialism's interference in these countries' internal affairs had been terminated. The imperialist states did everything possible to adjust to the new conditions and to retain their hold on the developing countries' economies so as to be able to influence the policies of the newly emergent states. Thus neocolonialism came into being.

The aim of neocolonialism is to preserve and extend the imperialist exploitation of young states so as to keep them within the ambit of world capitalism and prevent them from

developing along the lines of socialism. Neocolonialism's material foundation is the imperialist monopolies' private ownership of the means of production in developing countries; its social foundation is the top of the local exploiting classes and strata (monopolistic groups of the indigenous bourgeoisie, feudal elements, the bureaucratic and parasitical bourgeoisie); its ideological platform is anti-communism and various "mutual dependence" concepts spread by bourgeois ideologists to justify and whitewash neocolonialism.

Colonialism and neocolonialism have a lot in common. Both have their roots in capitalist and imperialist exploitation. The system of imperialism exists largely due to the imperialist countries' plunder and ruthless exploitation of the developing countries. Moreover, in the face of exacerbated contradictions of capitalism and the restricted sphere of capitalist domination, neocolonialism is an additional source of finance, enabling monopoly capital to resort to social manoeuvring and taking the edge off the social conflicts.

Neocolonialism applies various forms of pressure on dependent countries: unfair trade practices, machinations, discriminatory financial transactions, operations of multinational corporations. These are combined with application of military pressure upon newly independent states.

The significance of the export of capital by monopolies into newly free countries has vastly increased today. Whereas in the past the bulk of capital was invested in the extractive industries, currently it goes into various sectors of the economy. This is not to say that monopolies seek to promote the developing countries' industrialisation. As before, their purpose is to preserve these countries' dependence and to derive profits through the exploitation of their peoples. Monopolies try to strengthen their positions in the former colonies by taking hold of their key industries. They build assembly plants or factories turning out semi-finished goods—highly profitable undertaking. Often the monopolies transfer to developing countries enterprises which pollute the environment.

The workers are subjected to severe exploitation at the enterprises owned by imperialist monopolies. The daily pay of an assembly worker at a US electric engineering plant in Malaysia is one-fifth of the hourly pay of an assembly worker in

the United States. The same is true of many Asian, African, and Latin American states.

In recent years, there has been an increasing tendency for cooperation between foreign monopolies and local capital (both private and state), expressed in the setting up of mixed companies. This is, on the one hand, caused by the newly independent countries' desire to involve national capital in the enterprises set up by foreign monopolies. On the other hand, foreign capitalists strive to seize new markets and force out their rivals.

Foreign monopolies, even those that do not own the bulk of the capital of a given enterprise, are its actual owners. This is due to the fact that agreements on technological aid, management, etc., make the local enterprise dependent on foreign capital.

Imperialists use the scientific and technological revolution to attain neocolonialist objectives. Due to their vast technological superiority in this area, the imperialist powers are able to bar the young states' access to the achievements of science, impose on them such forms of technological transfer that set boundaries for these countries' economic independence and lead to substantial financial expenditure. Transnational monopolies raise the rates of payment for licences, technological aid and services, as well as the prices of semi-finished goods and machine parts supplied to developing countries. When agreements on the sales of technologies to developing countries are concluded, the monopolies lay down conditions that enable them to gain profits and control over the recipients of technological aid.

The brain-drain is also a form of neocolonialist exploitation which has markedly intensified in recent years. Developed capitalist countries entice specialists from Asian, African, and Latin American countries. Today, imperialist exploitation of the natural resources and cheap labour of developing countries is coupled with an organised system of draining the latter's intellectual resources.

Taking advantage of the narrow specialisation of newly independent countries, imperialist states build their trade relations with these countries on unfair terms. For example, the prices of industrial goods produced in capitalist coun-

tries are, as a rule, significantly higher than world prices.

The developing countries also become more financially dependent on imperialism. Today, they have found themselves in the imperialist states' financial bondage. The representatives of the leading capitalist countries reject any proposal containing radical decisions on this problem put forward by developing countries.

The sophisticated system of neocolonialist exploitation has had tragic consequences for developing nations. These countries, with the total population of more than two billion, have become, in fact, the region of poverty. Economic data reflect only one side of the matter. The gap is also due to illiteracy, ignorance, chronic malnutrition and hunger, high infant mortality, and epidemics killing many millions of people.

Mankind has imperialism to blame for this shameful situation.

To maintain their hold on young states, imperialist ruling circles employ political manoeuvring, promises, bribes, military threats and blackmail; not infrequently they directly interfere in the internal affairs of these countries.

By the mid-1980s, imperialism had significantly intensified its political and military pressure on developing countries. It sought to counter the socio-political changes occurring in a number of countries with warships, tanks, and aircraft.

Neocolonialism continues to set up strongholds in the developing countries. Several US military bases are situated in these countries.

The imperialist countries are trying to undermine the unity of developing countries, to set them against one another. Their splitting tactics is reflected in the line on "special relationship" with some developing countries—their "favourites".

Thus, neocolonialism's strategy has been taking into account the changed level of newly independent countries' socio-economic and political development: it has invented more flexible and sophisticated forms of their dependence.

Neocolonialism impedes socio-economic progress of the majority of the world's population. In the current age of transition from capitalism to socialism, the developing countries intensify their struggle against these policies of imperialism.

With the collapse of the colonial empires, over 100 states have gained their sovereignty. The downfall of imperialism's colonial system changed the correlation of forces in the world. To some extent, imperialism is bound to take into consideration the stand taken by the newly independent states in all world affairs. Life has proved that Lenin was right in saying that the struggle waged by the peoples of the East against colonial domination has an anti-imperialist character. Lenin saw in the national liberation movement the proletariat's ally in the struggle against imperialism as a system. The proletariat's struggle and the national liberation movement, wrote Lenin, differ from each other in the place they occupied in the world revolutionary process, the aims, the extent to which these aims are realised; nonetheless, they are directed against a common enemy—imperialism.

The contemporary revolutionary process shows that the national liberation struggle does not end with the attainment of political independence. Still, age-old backwardness and poverty cannot be eliminated until economic independence has been reached. This makes it imperative for these states to carry out transformations that would put a stop to the dependence of their national economies on foreign monopolies.

Imperialism's neocolonialist policies necessitate intensification of efforts to consolidate political independence and—even more important—economic independence, i.e., to build a national economy that rules out any dependence on imperialist monopolies. In other words, the contradiction between the newly independent countries and imperialism is still of a profound and long-term nature. It is precisely this contradiction that underlies the newly free nations' fight for independence and social progress. Imperialism's policy of exploitation and aggression toward the newly independent countries arouses protests among the popular masses, gives impetus to progressive movements and increases the scale of social demands.

The scale, diversity and intensity of the newly free countries' struggle for independence during the 1970s and 1980s enable us to draw the conclusion that it has entered a new stage. The objective of this struggle is the final elimination

of the political, economic, ideological, and cultural vestiges of colonialism.

When newly independent states nationalise foreign companies, they demonstrate their right to dispose of their own finance, natural resources, and other wealth. They have invigorated their effort aimed at restructuring economic relationships between the developing and the imperialist states on the basis of reciprocity and mutual benefit, at achieving a New International Economic Order. Today, this effort involves 125 states in Asia, Africa, and Latin America (the Group of 77). Coordinated positions are a major prerequisite of success in this effort. The CPSU sees this effort as a historical regularity and has taken practical steps towards establishing just international economic relations.

The 1970s and 1980s have shown that the newly independent countries now play a rather important role in world politics. In the United Nations, they have been vigorously protecting their own interests and opposing imperialism; in fact, they greatly influence decision-making in this organisation. In this connection, these countries' stand on the preservation of peace on Earth is assuming new importance. Most of the newly independent countries link the struggle for economic independence with the need to consolidate peace and the security of nations. Many of them support the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

One aspect of the developing countries' anti-imperialist struggle is the invigoration of the nonaligned movement. The 1980s have seen a significant rise in the movement's authority and influence in the sphere of relations with the countries of developed socialism. The nonaligned movement embraces over 100 countries with a total population of 1.5 billion people. The Eighth Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries (Harare, September 1986) reaffirmed its anti-imperialist thrust. The conference documents formulated the movement's task as intensification of collective efforts for universal security and the right of nations to decide their own destinies, and of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racism, apartheid, and Zionism. They reaffirm the demand that the Indian Ocean be declared a nuclear-free zone and the Mediterranean Sea—the zone of peace, approve the peace

initiatives advanced by the Soviet Union, and condemn the United States' aggressive and hegemonist policies.

For a more effective opposition to imperialism, the newly independent countries have set up regional international organisations with the purpose of coordinating positions and efforts as regards concrete issues of the anti-imperialist struggle. The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) embraces all African states except South Africa. One of its main objectives is elimination of the remnants of colonialism, neocolonialism, and racialism. The OAU has made major efforts towards the decolonisation of Africa; it supported the struggle of Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Namibia and other countries.

The Arab League, embracing 21 states, coordinates the Arab countries' military, political, and economic efforts against Israeli aggression, for the liberation of the occupied Arab territories, for the Palestinian people's right to statehood, and against US aggressive policies in this region.

In the current conditions of deep-going socio-economic changes in these countries, the population increasingly participates in social life. A distinguishing feature of the anti-imperialist emancipatory struggle is the rather profound character of revolutionary processes taking place in these countries, the processes influencing the choice of ways to settle acute socio-economic problems. In the past, when imperialism dominated the world, these nations had but one option—to develop along the path of capitalism; today, however, the situation has drastically changed. The example set by the Soviet Union, the country that has successfully resolved problems similar to those now facing Asian, African, and Latin American countries, and the intensive assistance rendered by the socialist countries to developing countries' effort to eliminate economic backwardness have shown the other path of development—transition to socialism skipping capitalist stage of development.

The record of the newly free countries' development shows that they are faced with the common objectives of eliminating the remnants of colonialism, strengthening political sovereignty and achieving economic independence. Today, these objectives constitute a democratic programme of changes including the protection of national sovereignty; the right to dispose of economic and natural resources; control of the state over the activ-

ities of foreign and local monopolies; promotion of the public sector which is to be turned into a means of weakening the positions of foreign monopolies and checking the growth of local monopoly capital; controlling and streamlining the activities of local capital in the interests of the national economy; settlement of the agrarian question with due account of the peasants' interest— a move necessary for developing the local market; democratisation of the government apparatus (the fight against corruption, bribery, etc.), and improvement of living standards.

The attainment of these objectives involves a two-faceted effort. Its external facet is the fight against imperialist monopolies' domination and new penetration of the national economy; this refers primarily to transnational corporations. The second (internal) facet is the struggle waged by progressive forces for a radical solution of these tasks in favour of the toiling masses. This brings to the fore the problem of democratising social life—which means that when major policies are worked out and important government decisions are taken, the interests of the masses must be taken into account. It also means that the broad popular masses must be widely represented on political and administrative bodies and that the activities of ultra-reactionary forces must be restricted, so that the political situation should be changed and make it possible for progressive forces to work among the masses and guide their struggle against imperialism, feudalism and reactionary forces. An important component of democratisation is recognition of the rights of trade unions and of peasant, student and other democratic organisations. All these tasks are of general democratic character. Their solution objectively benefits the overwhelming majority of the people. In other words, their solution promotes general national interests.

It is not possible to advance unless these tasks are successfully tackled. Still, there may be different ways and degrees of doing this—depending on what class, what political force, is leading the country and whether the democratic movement is strong enough.

The newly independent countries constitute a huge community of nations with various political regimes and uneven levels of economic and social development. Historical, cultural, and religious traditions of these nations also vary. It is an extremely multifaceted community, which has, in a comparatively short historical period, experienced major changes and which is now witnessing the development of new processes.

The group of newly independent countries that have chosen the capitalist path of development is numerically larger and is distinguished by highly diverse political, social, and economic characteristics. These countries differ in size and in natural wealth. The content and scale of general-democratic changes also vary from country to country, depending on the sections of the bourgeoisie that constitute the leadership. It may be the big compradore bourgeoisie closely associated with foreign monopolies, or the pro-Western bureaucratic bourgeoisie. These groups conduct domestic policies favourable to the top layers of the propertied classes; in their foreign policies, they often support aggressive policies of the United States.

In a number of countries, the course is shaped by political circles expressing the interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole (including small businessmen). Hence the line upon a "mixed economy" which benefits both the public and the state-capitalist sectors. The purpose of this is to prevent radical social changes in society, to ward off the danger of the rule of the bourgeoisie being eliminated.

Different as all these countries are, it is possible to trace certain common tendencies in their development.

All these countries are witnessing a swift development of capitalism. They have retained high annual rates of economic growth, and their industrial production has grown significantly. So far, however, this has failed to significantly change these countries' place within the world capitalist economy. They continue to be economically backward as compared with the developed capitalist states.

When it assumes power, the national bourgeoisie strives to strengthen and encourage the operation of public agencies in all realms of life. This is manifested primarily in the expansion

of the state's economic and social functions. The strengthening of the public sector makes it possible for the ruling class to exert significant influence on the development of the national economy.

The assertion of capitalist relations in these countries is an uneven and conflicting process. The rates of growth of the able-bodied population considerably exceed the rates of industrial growth. Hence the chronic unemployment and poverty, exacerbating social contradictions.

In most countries developing along the capitalist path agrarian reforms are carried out to reduce large-scale landed property and give land to the landless peasants. This, however, fails to effect radical changes in relations existing in the countryside. There are many reasons behind this. In a number of these countries, feudal lords still own large land holdings which they lease. The number of landless peasants diminishes but slowly. Quite often a peasant with a plot of land has no means of cultivating it. Turning the difficult situation of small-scale landowners to their advantage, money-lenders give them tools and seeds at a high rate of interest. Large tracts of land are still owned by foreign firms which ruthlessly exploit peasants and agricultural workers.

Bourgeois governments are aware that some old traditions in the countryside—those which impede the growth of food resources—must be changed. Inadequate supply of food and, therefore, hunger continue to be the lot of these countries. Since the mid-1960s, many countries have been trying to settle the food problem through mechanisation, land improvement undertakings, and cultivation of high-yield wheat and other cereals. This has become known as the Green Revolution. This process, indeed, has raised agricultural productivity. Facts have shown, though, that the Green Revolution does not improve the situation of the rural population. The use of machinery leaves vast masses of peasantry jobless, so they move to towns, thus increasing the urban army of homeless and unemployed. At the same time, there have appeared rich peasants in the countryside. They constitute the influential, albeit small, section of the agricultural community and are closely linked with the urban bourgeoisie.

The standard of living of the majority of the working popu-

lation is still very low. Polarisation tends to increase: the small group of the propertied classes grows richer while the bulk of the population grows poorer. Rising prices is a characteristic feature of the majority of these countries. Housing is scarce. The masses' discontent leads to political instability. This compels the ruling classes to shape government policies taking into account the interests of the people—but not always and not everywhere.

These, in sum, are the more typical features found in all the developing countries with capitalist orientation. They, needless to say, manifest themselves in different forms and degrees. All newly free countries that have embarked on the capitalist road of development are facing major economic problems that cannot be fully resolved in the course of capitalist development. Some of these countries see the solution in foreign capital investments in the national economy—in imperialist powers' "aid". This eventually increases their dependence on foreign capital and restricts independent decision-making in home and foreign policies.

Therefore, the record of development under the leadership of the bourgeoisie shows that capitalism cannot resolve the problem of national revival, does not provide solutions to cardinal socio-economic problems in such a way as to benefit the working people, and cannot rid nations of exploitation and oppression.

Historical experience shows that socialist orientation helps pursue general-democratic objectives.

It is well known that certain prerequisites are needed to build a socialist society. They include an appropriate level of the development of productive forces both in industry and agriculture, the existence of an organised working class with a certain level of political consciousness, etc. In economically less developed countries, these prerequisites may develop in the course of national democratic revolutions with an active participation of socialist-oriented forces. In this case, the interests of the working masses have the place of priority.

Theoretically, the possibility of economically backward countries' transition to socialism bypassing capitalism was approached by Marx and Engels. But it was only after the October Revolution in Russia (1917) that it acquired a practical sig-

nificance. Lenin elaborated this idea for countries freeing themselves from colonial domination in the absence of material prerequisites for socialist construction. Concerning the practical possibilities for some economically backward countries to build socialism skipping the capitalist stage of development, Lenin pointed out two relevant preconditions for success: (1) a rise in political consciousness, activity, and organisation of the working masses; (2) assistance by the victorious proletariat. In the course of this special stage of development, an economically backward country may introduce progressive changes while relying on socialist countries and allying itself with the international communist and working-class movement.

This can be achieved through revolutionary changes in all spheres of life in order to build, in a historically short period, the appropriate material base and to elevate the people's political consciousness for building socialism. For this, power should be exercised by representatives of the revolutionary-democratic sections of the population, which are opposed to capitalism.

In Lenin's view, the main prerequisite of progress along this road is a revolutionary organisation capable of inculcating in the masses the necessity of socialism and of rallying them for a conscious and creative effort for socialism. In the absence of a Marxist-Leninist party and with the working class just emerging, the advance towards socialism at the first stage may be headed by revolutionary-democratic parties and organisations. As general-democratic measures are carried out and objective preconditions for socialism develop, there arises an objective need to rely on the theory of scientific socialism.

Assistance by a victorious proletariat means the establishment of close and multifarious ties between the newly independent states and the socialist countries on the basis of agreements, including aid in repulsing aggression. Lenin also stressed that a country's orientation is its strictly internal affair.

History has provided several examples of the socialist way of development. The first is the Soviet Eastern Republics' transition from feudalism to socialism, guided by a proletarian party, and drawing on extensive economic assistance from the entire Soviet people. The Soviet Central Asian

Republics effected the transition in a very short historical period.

The second example is provided by Mongolia. It became a sovereign state and achieved a transition from precapitalist relations to socialism relying on all-round assistance rendered by the Soviet Union. Of great importance here is the fact that the two countries are neighbours; besides, concluded between them was an agreement on friendship, cooperation and mutual aid which prevented interference by counter-revolutionary forces from without. A revolutionary-democratic party headed the building of a new life, changing its character and composition with the growth of industry and the working class. In 1921, Party members numbered only a few dozen. In 1981, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party had 75,000 members, over a third of whom were industrial workers.

It need not be stressed that the Mongolian model is specific. However, it is worthy of study because today many of the countries that have embarked on the socialist road of development are facing problems similar to those Mongolia has successfully resolved.

In the 1960s, revolutionary-democratic regimes came to power in some Asian and African states. Rejecting capitalism, they opted for socialist orientation. These countries began to carry out a series of democratic reforms with the purpose of strengthening their political regimes and building independent national economies that would secure them equitable positions in the international arena. Their experience proves that in the face of present-day correlation of forces in the world, more possibilities have been created for the formerly enslaved nations to reject capitalism and build their future without exploiters and for the benefit of the working people. In a number of the countries, however, these regimes rely not so much on the working masses as on the army and the state apparatus. Democratic changes in these countries proceed in conditions of acute class struggle, both internally and in the international arena. As before, imperialism strives to keep these countries within the ambit of the capitalist system because of their great strategical and economic importance.

Thus appeared another socio-political form of transition to socialism—socialist orientation. This phenomenon is of great historical significance.

Today, the population of the socialist-oriented states exceeds 150 million. These countries develop along progressive lines in different ways and in complicated conditions. However, there are features common to all forms of this development. They include gradual elimination of the positions occupied by imperialist monopolies, tribal chiefs, the reactionary bourgeoisie and feudal lords, as well as restriction of the operation of foreign capital and consolidation of the public sector in the national economy. Of great importance is the fact that the people's state captures the commanding heights of the national economy, effects a gradual transfer to a planned development of productive forces, and encourages cooperative movement in the countryside. Greatly helpful in these transformations are the increased participation of the toiling masses in economic and political life and the gradual strengthening of the state apparatus by local people devoted to the popular cause. Socialist-oriented countries pursue anti-imperialist foreign policies, and the revolutionary parties protecting the interests of broad sections of the working people are growing stronger.

Obviously, there are general-democratic objectives facing all the newly independent countries. However, in socialist-oriented countries the means of attaining them differ from those in the countries developing along capitalist lines. In the former, radical solutions are found in the interest of the working people; in the latter, these objectives are approached, if at all, in terms of bourgeois reformism and the class positions of the bourgeoisie, and in the interest of capitalist development. The numerical growth, increasing independence and successes of the socialist-oriented countries significantly influence the internal processes in the states with capitalist orientation. This gives an increasingly stronger revolutionary impetus to the masses' struggle to direct their countries toward socialist orientation.

The peculiarity of the socialist-oriented countries' socio-political development lies, primarily, in the fact that the agent of social progress in these countries is not the proletariat (too weak in most of these countries for that role) but representatives of the local intelligentsia, including officers in the army,

which is of petty-bourgeois origin, and the sections of urban and rural population ready to oppose the domination of foreign imperialism in all its forms, i.e., the sections defined as revolutionary-democratic.

The revolutionary-democratic parties that assumed power in these countries declared their rejection of capitalism; many of them, however, were not ready to accept scientific socialism in full and have accepted only one of the components of scientific socialism—its economic principles: nationalisation, cooperation, property socialisation, payment according to work done, agrarian reform, training of local personnel. Not all the revolutionary-democratic parties and regimes are guided by such basic principles of scientific socialism as assignment of the leading role to the working class and its party, and large-scale involvement of the working people in managerial activities. This conceptual inconsistency has made itself felt in the practices of these parties and regimes.

The experience so far accumulated helps distinguish the following features peculiar to the practices of the socialist-oriented countries.

The process of pushing out imperialist monopolies from the national economy is combined with a certain degree of cooperation with foreign capital under government control aimed at achieving development objectives. The edging out of foreign capital is, in a number of cases, carried out simultaneously with the implementation of measures adopted against the indigenous big bourgeoisie in order to weaken big private capital and place it under state control.

Elimination of economic backwardness is effected through the creation of an independent national economy, transformation of agriculture (the public sector inclusive), and a switchover to planned economic growth. Industrialisation facilitates the growth of the working class, first of all at state-owned enterprises.

The creation and expansion of the public sector prevents the growth of the entrepreneur bourgeoisie. At the same time, the public sector shows a highly contradictory development; there are numerous state-owned enterprises showing very low efficiency. In some cases, the public sector is used by certain circles close to the government for personal enrichment, spawning a

new layer of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie opposed to social renewal.

In a number of countries, agrarian reforms have undermined the basis of the feudal-landowner and money-lender types of exploitation and eliminated the feudal class. The layer of landless peasants and small-scale landowners has been significantly reduced. Quite often, the agrarian reforms are carried out without the participation of broad peasant masses, thus leading to an increase in the number and influence of exploiters in the countryside.

Measures adopted to promote education, culture and the training of national cadres are of a mass character and, therefore, objectively lead to the democratisation of social life.

The introduction of new social and labour legislation improves the situation of the working masses.

The anti-imperialist foreign policy course strengthens these countries' solidarity with national liberation, anti-imperialist and anti-racist movements, and fosters their cooperation with socialist countries.

Complicated and often contradictory as these processes are, the directions of socio-economic transformations are clear: they gradually lead to changes in social relations, undermine the exploiting classes' economic base and curb their political influence. Today we can justly say that socialist orientation has proved its viability. This is shown by the socialist-oriented countries' numerical growth and political stability. In many of these countries the foundations of revolutionary-democratic home and foreign policies have been consolidated, the sphere of social changes has expanded, and the state has come to play a bigger role in economic life. Further development in this direction requires that the masses become more active, that they play a greater role in social and political life. This, however, does not always happen.

Some revolutions "from above" are not supported "from below". In some countries with revolutionary-democratic regimes the masses' activities are sometimes restricted, and mass-scale social organisations do not develop. Therefore, democratisation of social life and the awakening of the masses' political awareness and initiative continue to be a major objective yet to be attained in some countries of socialist orientation.

The common policy line of the socialist-oriented countries has an anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, and anti-feudal thrust. Socialist orientation, however, presupposes that the public and private sectors coexist for quite a long time. In these conditions, needless to say, the bourgeois elements will continue, to a certain extent, to influence the country's policies, even in those states where the revolutionary-democratic forces hold key economic and political positions. That is why development along the road of socialism is sure to be accompanied by an acute class struggle. The danger of a departure from socialist orientation will persist until the working class, in alliance with other revolutionary forces, assumes the dominant position in the country.

Also, it must be kept in mind that the countries of socialist orientation still remain within the system of the world capitalist economy, with which they have long-standing links. The level of their economies does not make it possible to sever these links. This impedes their efforts to free themselves from the economic and political pressure of imperialist monopolies.

Under these conditions, socialist-oriented programmes can be implemented by relying on the toiling masses, primarily on the working class, by consolidating all progressive forces and by extending and promoting ties with the world socialist system, alongside a consistent anti-imperialist policy.

In a number of socialist-oriented countries, revolutionary-democratic regimes have declared their adherence to the theory and practice of scientific socialism. Their party programmes contain major provisions of scientific socialism: elimination of exploitation of man by man, transfer of the means of production to the people, income distribution according to work done, cooperation of small-scale producers in town and country, etc.

The levels of economic and socio-political development are not the same in all countries, hence the variety of forms and rates of development towards socialism. Their common feature is the need to build advanced national economies and to awaken the masses' national and class awareness. The working class is emerging in these countries, along with industrial production. The political regimes of this group of countries are distinguished by clarity of purpose and class position. Under way is the process of formation of new revolutionary parties called van-

guard parties, i.e., the parties that are leading the way to scientific socialism. So far, they have made initial, but very important steps in this direction.

To sum up, the emancipatory struggle in developing countries advances along various directions and assumes different forms. Consolidation of the anti-imperialist, democratic and progressive forces is, now as before, the major prerequisite for its success. Of great importance is the strengthening of the alliance between the developing countries' anti-imperialist liberation movement and the world socialist system, and also the working class and all democratic forces of the capitalist countries.

Chapter Seven

THE VANGUARD OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

The Fight for Workers' Interests

The international communist movement plays a major role in the worldwide opposition of the forces of peace, progress and socialism to the forces of war, reaction and imperialism.

Communists are the driving force of all major progressive changes in mankind's life.

Before discussing the life and work of today's Communists it is worthwhile recalling how the communist movement came into being.

The communist movement dates back to the 1840s, when there emerged the Communist League (*Bund der Kommunisten*) led by Marx and Engels, and when the International Working Men's Association (the First International) was set up. At the close of the 19th century independent workers' parties sprang up in a number of countries, followed by the formation of the Second International.

During World War I the leaders of most of the social-democratic parties constituting the Second International openly sided with the bourgeoisie and supported the imperialist war, thus betraying the interests of the working people. These parties helped the bourgeoisie of their countries to suppress the revolutions that unfolded in a number of European countries under the impact of the October 1917 Socialist Revolution in Russia. They therefore ceased to exist as revolutionary parties and subsequently, the Second International collapsed.

Under Lenin's guidance, the Marxist groups of the social-democratic parties joined forces to organise the Third (Communist) International (the Comintern). Set up in March 1919, the Comintern helped Marxist groups to develop into indepen-

dent parties and to raise leadership cadres. Generalising the experience of fraternal parties, it armed them with jointly worked-out documents relating to issues of theory, strategy, and tactics, as well as ways of winning over the masses and orienting them on a revolution. Lenin's work, *"Left-Wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder*, had an important role to play in this respect.

The Comintern became a truly international organisation, embracing Communist parties of all continents. It organised international activities in support of the forces fighting for the working people's interests, for transformation of social relations. An important role was played by the movement in support of the young Soviet Republic; the campaign in defence of the Bulgarian Communist Georgi Dimitrov, whose 1933 court trial the German fascists sought to exploit to make Communists look as exporters of revolution; the Spanish Civil War of 1936-1939, when Communists and other representatives of progressive forces heroically defended the Spanish Republic against German and Italian fascist aggressors.

The Seventh Comintern Congress (1936) outlined the formation of a broad workers' and popular front as well as broad-based political and social alliances against the dangers of fascism and war. The Comintern greatly contributed to the victory of democratic forces over Nazism, and, in some countries, to the triumph over exploiters. In 1943, having attained its objectives, the Comintern announced its dissolution. At that time there already existed 70 Communist parties in the world.

Today, the international communist movement is the advanced force of the struggle waged by the working people the world over. The movement is an association of equal and independent national Communist and workers' parties united by a single ideology—Marxism-Leninism. They are brought together by the struggle for common goals and against the common enemy—imperialism. The international communist movement does a great deal to rally all anti-war forces in the effort to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. It initiates massive solidarity campaigns in support of the peoples subjected to imperialist aggression and also to military and economic pressure.

As the vanguard of the working class, Communists play the

leading role in the unification of all forces fighting for peace and social progress. As an international force, Communists exert an ever greater influence on world politics. They constitute the only political force acting in all the echelons of the world revolutionary process. This makes it possible for them to purposefully influence all contingents of the revolutionary movement and combine their efforts.

Today, Communist parties exist in some 100 countries, and their total membership is about 80 million. There are Communist parties in all socialist countries, 27 developed capitalist countries, 24 Latin American and Caribbean countries, and 29 developing countries in Asia and Africa.

The ruling Communist parties of socialist countries constitute, according to the relative weight and tasks they are implementing, the most advanced section of the international communist movement. These parties are guiding the building of a new society in their respective countries. Communists of socialist countries see their primary objective in the further development of each socialist country and the socialist system as a whole, and also in greater cohesion and unity of socialist countries. They direct the unfolding process of switching over to new methods of management, in the sphere of both national economy and public life, so as to ensure an ever greater scale of the working people's participation in this process.

Fulfilling these tasks, the Communist parties combine the effort to accelerate socio-economic development in their countries with opposition to imperialism's pressures on all fronts and promotion of peace on Earth. The results of the ruling parties' activities are largely determined by their ability to creatively apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism and to avoid subjective errors endangering socialism's gains. The more mature the party, the greater its successes in socialist construction and the fulfilment of international tasks.

Needless to say, the course of socialist construction (as explained in preceding chapters) did not proceed smoothly. Not all undertakings were successful, and some mistakes were made. This is not very surprising. The Communist parties of socialist countries are now, as before, breaking new ground and have to overcome enormous difficulties apt to be encountered by a trail-blazer. The need to wage a persistent struggle against in-

ternational imperialism and reaction has also told on the success of this process.

The achievements scored by the Communist parties of socialist countries augment the might of the world communist and revolutionary movement. In some developed capitalist nations Communist parties have succeeded in having a say in the administration of the country; in others, they have become a significant factor of political life. The parties are extending the scale of their activity in bourgeois-democratic institutions and mass movements. They make efforts to set up broad social and political alliances in order to reduce the power of monopolies and thwart their onslaught on the working people's socio-economic gains, as well as to facilitate the solution of urgent issues of national and international development.

The primary objective of the Communist parties in Asian and African countries is to consolidate their countries' political and economic independence, ensure their advance along the path of social progress. This objective is also expressed in the struggle against neocolonialism and for the interests of working masses. In the newly independent African countries, Communists are joining forces with the left wing of revolutionary-democratic parties. This process leads to the creation of a new stream in the revolutionary movement relying largely on Marxist-Leninist principles.

In Latin American countries Communists greatly contribute to the emergence of common patriotic revolutionary front aimed at undermining the power of bourgeois-latifundist oligarchies, achieving democratic changes, and at weakening the positions of US imperialism in the region.

Due to the Communists' increased unfluence on the world situation, not a single international political issue can be settled without taking into account the stand of the communist and working-class movement. Because of this, every Communist party, be it large or small, exerts a definite influence on the public life of its country. Communists are the staunchest champions of the working people's liberation from all kinds of social or national oppression. Under the guidance or with the participation of Communists the working people in many countries have won major socio-economic and political rights and changes. In their struggle for the working people's interests,

Communists have proved to be selfless fighters convinced in their just cause and loyal to their ideals; they are tempered in many trials.

Most Communist parties have become political forces to be reckoned with in their countries. They have won considerable influence in trade unions, various democratic organisations and mass movements. In some countries, Communists receive appreciable votes. They win seats in parliaments and city councils, where they fight for the interests of the working people. Of great significance are initiatives concerning various aspects of social life and government policy put forth by Communist parties.

Along with large and influential Communist parties, there exist small and less influential ones. This is explained by many reasons, and the primary one is the conditions in which Communists work in a given country. Nearly half of all the Communist parties operate illegally or semi-legally. In many countries, including developed capitalist countries, all sorts of campaigns and subversive activities are organised to discredit Communists and undermine their influence. Their position is also made difficult by their occasional failure to offer a fitting rebuff to anti-communism spread among the masses by bourgeois and reformist parties as well as the mass media. There are also such reasons as insufficient party activity, inadequate work among the masses, errors made in search of methods of struggle and ways to increase influence.

Notwithstanding the difficulties, the importance of the world communist movement is increasing. This is because the diversity of processes currently unfolding in the world and the invigoration of various anti-imperialist forces demand its uniting influence.

The communist movement is able to solve its tasks because its activities have a scientific basis. Guided by Marxism-Leninism—the science about laws of social development—and creatively developing the theory of scientific socialism, Communist parties can correctly analyse the processes occurring in the world, predict changes due to happen in society and, hence, formulate their policies according to the concrete conditions of the struggle.

The Strategy and Tactics of Communist Parties in Capitalist Countries

The Communist parties of developed capitalist countries have achieved considerable political weight in their countries.

They focus attention on the most significant issues in the setting of the deepening general crisis of capitalism: the causes of the present-day crisis development of the economy and ways to combat it; the political and social consequences of this deep crisis and also its impact on the consciousness and behaviour of various social groups; the part played in these conditions by the bourgeois parliamentary system and its institutions, etc.

In developed capitalist countries, the struggle against the negative consequences of the technological reorganisation, for the creation of new jobs in the face of mass-scale unemployment, and to make STR achievements serve the interests of all working people has acquired primary importance.

The Communists work hard to find alternatives that would protect the interests of the working people against the policy of the monopolistic state.

Communists of these countries attach particular importance to the constructive activities in anti-war and other massive movements of a general-democratic character—activities aimed at increasing the role of the working class and its organisations in these movements.

The working people in these countries fight to preserve and extend democratic transformations, and to reduce the power of monopolies. Life has shown that rather diverse sections of the population rally around democratic demands. In the course of the struggle, the masses learn from their own political experience that urgent problems cannot be solved within the framework of bourgeois society. Through this, they can realise the need to break through the barriers of bourgeois democracy. This is not to say that they can embrace socialist ideology at this point. Still, it is the beginning of the realisation that a radical transformation of society is necessary to attain democratic goals. In other words, the masses are brought closer to understanding socialism as a qualitatively new type of democracy, an effective form of people's power.

In the course of their fight for democratic goals, the work-

ing class and its allies manage to introduce changes restricting the power of monopolies and to gain important positions in all spheres: economic, social and political. In these conditions, a peaceful transition to socialism is possible through intermediate stages of struggle and forms of power. In the course of struggle for broad social alliances, the working class becomes aware of its vanguard role, while the experience of the joint struggle makes its allies recognise that role. Thus, the working class, heading the struggle at its democratic stage, acquires through this the knowledge needed to lead the non-proletarian masses along the road to socialism.

Success in the transition to socialism through the stage of struggle for democratic goals is ensured by the revolutionary party's activities, its purposeful, science-based, firm and at the same time flexible policy. That is why the Communist parties of capitalist countries consider it their primary objective to advance demands promoting the interests of various social strata and the transformation of all spheres of social life. These demands are aimed both at solving urgent problems and attaining intermediate goals that will create prerequisites for a radical transformation of society. Today, the Communist parties put forward alternative programmes ensuring a democratic solution to the crisis, programmes of national development, and projects relating to some particular economic branches. At the same time, they work for the people's democratic participation in decision-making concerning all areas of life, and also for democratic foreign policies.

Many of the measures suggested by Communists today can be implemented under conditions of private ownership of the means of production. Therefore, they may find support on the part of the majority of society. The struggle for their implementation will promote the masses' political education and their realisation of the fact that the monopolist state cannot solve vital problems in favour of the working people. At the same time, in their policy documents the Communists of capitalist countries maintain that only socialism can ultimately solve these problems. These documents outline the perspective development of the non-proletarian strata (including small-scale producers and the intelligentsia) under socialism.

Unity of action of the working class in the capitalist coun-

tries has acquired particular importance. In these countries, the working class constitutes the majority of the population. Effecting this unity, however, requires first and foremost unity of action on the part of Communists and Social Democrats.

The Communists act on the premise that the ideological differences existing between them, on the one hand, and the Social Democrats, on the other, must not impede the unity of action in relation to many urgent problems facing the working-class movement. While they favour the principle of independence of each party, they reserve the right to defend Marxism-Leninism and to criticise their partners' inconsistency shown in the fulfilment of obligations undertaken by the latter in the common struggle.

At the same time, the Communists treat working Social Democrats as their class brothers and show deep respect for their contribution to the common cause. The sole condition of co-operation that the Communists put forward is rejection of concessions to the bourgeoisie detrimental to working-class interests.

Meanwhile, there is a growing need for the Communists to learn a lesson from their cooperation with Social Democrats and other allies. Experience has shown that the extent to which Communists influence the character of this cooperation depends on the degree to which they have asserted themselves as a revolutionary party, on whether the masses are aware of the difference between the position of the Communists and that of their partners. Communists seek cooperation to promote the struggle against the monopolies' anti-popular policies, and for the interests of the working people.

Trade unions are the main battlefield of the struggle for working-class unity of action (along with cooperation in election campaigns, bourgeois-democratic institutions, national campaigns, etc.). In the trade unions, where both the Communists and Social Democrats work to find immediate solutions to the working people's daily problems, it is highly important, and easier, to work out common positions and actions.

Increasing unification tendencies that can in recent years be traced in the working-class and democratic movement, in the trade unions first and foremost, facilitate the attainment of unity of action. Today, when capitalists seek to utilise the difficul-

ties caused by economic crises and the negative consequences of technological reorganisation to eliminate the socio-economic gains made by the working-class movement, the central issue of the working people's unity of action is protection of the rights and gains of the trade unions.

The Communist parties are guided by Lenin's tenet: the broader the social base of the struggle against the exploiting classes, against imperialism, the more ideological and organisational firmness is required on the part of the Communists.

Communists of Asian and African Countries

The political and socio-economic conditions under which Marxist-Leninist parties in Asian and African countries function are as highly diversified as their influence on the masses. Some of the parties are mass organisations playing a significant role in their countries' political life, and actively furthering the working people's interests by using various forms of struggle. They are represented in parliaments and other legislative bodies.

Some parties with considerable experience in revolutionary struggle have met with objective and subjective difficulties and, as a result, incurred substantial losses. Today, these parties are regenerating and taking hold of their positions in the masses. However, quite often they have to function in illegal or semi-legal conditions, and this creates additional difficulties for them.

One group of Communist parties, primarily those operating in economically backward countries with numerically small and politically undeveloped working class, have not yet managed to secure a mass base, although they are an active political force.

Proceeding from the character of the contemporary stage in African and Asian countries' historical development, the Communist parties see their strategic objective in the struggle to implement or complete the national-democratic revolutions in order to create objective and subjective preconditions for effecting socialist revolutions.

The Communist parties of the countries of capitalist orientation direct the masses towards the struggle for more democracy, economic independence, and cardinal socio-economic

changes which are to place these countries on the path of socialism. The revolutionary parties of the countries of socialist orientation help consolidate the revolutionary-democratic regimes and strengthen the states' anti-imperialist policy.

The most important and difficult component of the Communist parties' strategy at the present stage of the national democratic revolutions is fostering the masses' awareness of the necessity of the struggle for socialism. This brings to the fore the task of strengthening Communist parties to make them truly mass revolutionary parties capable of leading broad sections of the working people. The accomplishment of this complex task requires much time and effort. It must be borne in mind that the majority of the population of these countries still remains illiterate and have no access to basic sources of political information.

Inasmuch as the majority of the population are objectively interested in implementing the goals of the national-democratic revolutions, the Marxist-Leninist parties do all they can to set up alliances of anti-imperialist, patriotic, democratic and progressive forces. The immediate aim of the united front tactics is to facilitate the revolutionary and progressive forces' effort to find a key to the broad masses of the working people and win them over to the side of the struggle for social progress. That is why the Communist parties consider the working class, peasants, progressive intellectuals, the urban middle strata, and a certain section of the national bourgeoisie as driving forces of the national-democratic revolution.

The working class of Asian and African countries is relatively small but its numerical strength continues to increase along with the growth of industry. Its composition is changing qualitatively, and the proportion of industrial workers is on the rise. At the same time, a considerable section of the workers are still at a low level of cultural development. Many of them have no experience in political struggle, some are gripped by petty-bourgeois, religious and other prejudice. All this impedes class education of the proletariat and its ability to act as a leading political force.

The peasantry comprises over two-thirds of the population in the newly independent countries and has a great revolutionary potential. In some countries the peasantry is a major anti-

imperialist (albeit often spontaneous) force. It has a low level of organisation and political independence, determined by its class nature. This is explained by their lack of unity, low literacy level and underdeveloped political consciousness. Bourgeois parties skilfully play on this to exert their own influence on the peasant masses. All political forces try to win over the peasantry. This heightens the responsibility of the revolutionary forces. Thus, it is of specal importance that Communists should work in the countryside in order to establish and consolidate the worker-peasant alliance.

The middle strata constitute the majority of the urban population in developing countries. Artisans and small-scale merchants are the major portion of the urban "middle class". Other sections are the "lower strata": domestic servants, hotel and restaurant staff, and other persons often with casual earnings. These sections of the middle strata—the wage-earners—are subjected to severe exploitation and are caught in a life-long fight for existence.

Local intellectuals are the most influential section of the middle strata. Although small in numbers, they possess specialised knowledge and political education and can, therefore, influence the course of social development. They usually constitute a social layer with a fairly strong anti-neocolonialist sentiment. In recent years, stratification has been evident in this layer. Some intellectuals have enhanced their ties with the bourgeoisie or new bureaucracy; others are inclined to side with the working people. Communists take account of this heterogeneity of the urban middle strata. In their view, the middle strata can be the proletariat's ally in the effort to attain general-democratic goals. Hence, the Communists have intensified political work among the urban middle strata.

In most countries, the bourgeois class is highly heterogeneous. Small-scale businessmen constitute a major section of this class. There are also the middle and the big bourgeoisie. In some countries, a section of the local monopoly bourgeoisie has emerged. The nature of the bourgeoisie's ties with imperialism is not the same in all countries either.

Those sections of the bourgeoisie whose economic interest imperialism encroaches upon have a stake in independent eco-

nomic and political development as well as domination at the national market. These sections form the so-called national or patriotic bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie's anti-imperialist, anti-neocolonialist, or anti-feudal positions are, needless to say, determined primarily by their own class interests—the desire to be masters of their own countries and take an equal part in world market transactions.

Still, history has shown that the bourgeois class is inconsistent in its anti-imperialist struggle. Once it assumes power, the bourgeoisie is in favour of economic independence, since it promotes its own interests. At the same time, it exploits the people and strives to establish its rule over the masses. The bourgeois class fears genuine democratisation of social life and activisation of the toiling masses; therefore, it is ready to form an alliance with the forces it formerly opposed.

At the present stage, increasing exploiter and anti-popular tendencies can be traced in the policy of the ruling bourgeoisie in some Asian and African countries. This intensifies the class struggle. The Communist parties champion the working people's interests; at the same time, they support those undertakings of the bourgeoisie and bourgeois governments that facilitate independent economic development, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the struggle for peace and security of nations.

Communists also take into account the fact that the bourgeoisie and its parties have a fairly large following of working people. The involvement of the patriotic layers of the bourgeoisie in the anti-imperialist, anti-neocolonialist and anti-feudal struggle makes it possible to weaken the positions of monopoly capital and reaction and, at the same time, to awaken political consciousness in the masses. The contradictoriness of the bourgeoisie's political stand in the course of the struggle cures the masses of any illusions concerning the bourgeoisie.

In most African and Asian countries, progressive forces strive to set up broad alliances facilitating the struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism and internal reaction, as well as for democracy and social progress.

The concrete goals to be achieved by such alliances are shaped by the social, economic and political situation in the given country. Practice shows that in all cases, a militant, anti-imperialist and democratic front cannot be created solely through

summit agreements. It is shaped in the process of the struggle waged by the masses. The Marxist-Leninist parties are called upon to play an important role in the formation and strengthening of the front. It falls to them to find the ways and forms of alliances—a difficult task requiring evaluation of the objective correlation of class forces in each country and at each stage of the revolution.

In the socialist-oriented countries where both revolutionary-democratic and Communist parties exist, the Marxist-Leninist parties are faced with a difficult task—that of correctly identifying the place and role of revolutionary democracy in the national democratic revolution, making a sober assessment of their own possibilities, and working out tactics on the basis of all this.

Historical experience has shown that as democratic changes become more profound and the need arises to translate into reality the socio-economic programme of an anti-capitalist character, class and political differentiation develops in the ranks of the revolutionary democracy. The process of stratification within the revolutionary democracy in the 1970s and in the present decade has revealed certain peculiarities. In certain countries, the right wing has been more active and some reactionary shifts have been evident, including departure from socialist orientation. These trends manifested themselves mainly among that section of the revolutionary democracy which was alien to scientific socialism. They are, in a large measure, connected with the development of a new layer of the bourgeoisie that embraces a section of the revolutionary democracy—the bureaucratic bourgeoisie who uses its positions in the party and government apparatus to further its own selfish ends.

Stratification of the revolutionary democracy has acquired a clear-cut class character, and has in practice manifested itself in the alienation from the masses and a gap between word and deed. The right wing impedes the implementation of progressive measures, substitutes nationalist for social goals, and opposes concerted action with the Communists, sometimes fanning belligerent nationalism and religious fanaticism. In fact, this trend is alienating itself from the revolutionary democracy.

In some countries the commanding positions are held by rev-

olutionary democrats who favour consistent measures in tune with socialist principles and declare their adherence to scientific socialism. There is a section within their ranks which sticks to what is called a centrist or intermediate position and searches for compromise solutions to outstanding issues. In some cases it may give its support to the left wing, and in others—to the right wing.

It should be also kept in mind that neocolonialism is using new methods to penetrate some sections of the revolutionary democracy in order to weaken young states. For this purpose, it makes use of inter-state disputes and nationalistic trends.

The prospects of social development in socialist-oriented countries are, to a considerable degree, dependent on the interrelationships of the two influential political trends of the present-day emancipatory struggle: Communists and revolutionary democrats.

Communists do not view divergence of opinion on some questions as an obstacle to alliance with the revolutionary democracy in the common struggle against imperialism and for a socialist future. They are in favour of this alliance. The relations between Communists and revolutionary democrats develop both at the international and national levels. Cooperation involving revolutionary-democratic parties, the CPSU, and other Communist parties is pursued along the line of inter-party ties.

The fact that Communists and revolutionary democrats have a common platform creates the possibility of long-term cooperation and consolidation of all democratic forces in a broad anti-imperialist national-democratic front.

The question of correct correlation of political forces within the front has a definite significance for further revolutionary development. Cooperation of these forces is possible on condition of mutual respect and organisational, political, and ideological independence of the parties forming the front.

The question of cooperation with Communists is still at issue within the revolutionary democracy. Aside from ideological differences, the situation is complicated by the tendency, still evident in certain sections of the revolutionary democracy, to treat Communists with suspicion and sometimes even hostility, and by the failure to understand the historical role played by the Communist parties in the emancipatory struggle. This is

explained by the tenacity of the prejudice created by anti-communist propaganda, mistrust of the Communists' internationalist positions and ties, and the urge for political monopoly. The Communists, meanwhile, stress that neither they nor the revolutionary democrats hold monopoly of the revolutionary spirit, democracy or socialism. Both have a great obligation and responsibility for common honest work in the interest of the people and protection of their own nation, for the benefit of the workers, peasants, and all the working people.

Revolutionary Processes in Latin American Countries

Latin America and the Caribbean countries differ in the level of socio-economic development and the nature of political regimes. The tendency that in recent decades could be observed in all these countries is accelerated development of capitalism. Large-scale industries are growing. The public sector, which today absorbs roughly a third of all capital investments, is expanding. Capitalist relations are taking hold in ever more branches of agriculture. The increasing concentration of industrial production and capital leads to the emergence and strengthening of local monopolies. At the same time, the survivals of precapitalist structures still persist in a number of countries.

The economic structure in most Latin American countries is marked by the domination of a bloc of foreign monopolies, headed by those of the US and the local oligarchy. Therefore, if these countries are to develop progressively and independently, they must decisively break with the present economic patterns and free themselves from imperialist domination.

The domination of foreign monopolies has (1) created a constantly growing gap between the levels of economic development of Latin American and Caribbean countries, on the one hand, and the developed capitalist countries, on the other; (2) thrown these countries ever farther back in the field of utilisation of scientific and technological progress for the purposes of economic development and (3) preserved the harsh exploitation of the working class, massive unemployment, shrinking of peasant-owned land plots and exploitation of peasants by big landowners, and an extremely low standard of living.

US imperialism, compelled to take into account the fact that

most Latin American countries have a more than 150-year record of political independence, seek to exercise their domination primarily through local bourgeois élites represented by the financial or latifundist oligarchy. In actual fact, US imperialism is not so much an external pressure as a sort of effective, albeit secret, internal factor. This tends to disorient the masses. The Communists' objective in this connection is to make the masses aware that the struggle for total independence is, first and foremost, the struggle against foreign monopolies headed by the United States, and also against its allies within the country—the local oligarchy.

Though in all the Latin American countries the revolutionary processes have an anti-imperialist thrust, they develop unevenly and their content varies from country to country. Some countries have but a minimum of material prerequisites for socialism but, due to a number of reasons, the objectives of anti-imperialist, democratic, agrarian revolution are on the agenda. There are also countries where the people are fighting to establish sovereign states.

All the countries of the continent are yet to implement a great number of general-democratic measures (agrarian reform, democratisation of the government apparatus and public life, creation of independent national economies, etc.). The Communist parties realise that in these countries the revolutionary process has its own peculiarities—complicated intertwining of the struggle against imperialism and the local oligarchy, the struggle for total national independence with the struggle for democracy and socialism. The main objective of these nations is the struggle for democratic and anti-imperialist transformations which could later grow into a struggle for socialism.

Evidently, the anti-imperialist and general-democratic tasks will increasingly converge with the goals of profound socialist transformations as the revolutionary processes advance. The correlation of these objectives, the degree to which they are accomplished, as well as the forms and methods of their achievement will, needless to say, vary from country to country.

The Marxist-Leninists of Latin America agree that there will be two stages in the revolution's development: the anti-imperialist and general-democratic stage, and the socialist stage. They consider US imperialism the main obstacle to revo-

lutionary process and the chief enemy of Latin American and Caribbean countries. This view is proved by the experience of the Cuban revolution and the lessons of revolution in Chile.

The policy of the popular government in Chile had a great revolutionising impact on the life of the entire continent. No wonder, therefore, that the counter-revolutionary forces, aided by the United States, did all they could to eliminate that government.

The Chilean lesson has demonstrated the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theses that:

—the old ruling classes will not give up power without struggle, and hence a new power must be able to defend itself, arms in hand if need be;

—a relevant condition is the leading role of the working class, united and consolidated leadership, agreement of opinion on at least all major questions on the part of all members of the coalition;

—peaceful winning of power, i.e. assumption of power through political means, is possible but the class enemy must not be disregarded and all possible means of class struggle must be used in the interests of the people;

—consolidation of the worker and peasant alliance is very important; to ensure the victory of the revolution it is necessary to draw on its side the urban middle strata and neutralise certain sections of the non-monopolist bourgeoisie;

—it is a very dangerous thing to stick to illusions about bourgeois democracy and its institutions (the army, police, court, etc.); urgent and drastic measures to democratise these institutions are needed, concerning first and foremost the repressive organs;

—it is necessary to wage unwavering ideological struggle with the "right" and "left" deviations in the movement, in particular as concerns its leadership.

The defeat suffered by the Chilean revolution dealt a serious blow to all progressive forces on the continent. Nonetheless, the reactionary forces failed to eliminate the revolutionary process.

Eleven of the 24 Communist parties in the region operate under illegal or semi-legal conditions. Most have behind them a difficult path of struggle. The present-day communist move-

ment of the Latin American continent is a seasoned militant revolutionary vanguard. Proceeding from the socio-economic level of the majority of countries, and the nature of and basic tendencies in their development, the Communist parties have defined the general strategic line as a struggle for peace and democratic changes, against imperialism and domestic reaction in order to create conditions favourable to the struggle for socialism. At the same time, the Communist parties stress that the peculiarities of the political and socio-economic situation in each country should be taken into account.

Unification of all progressive forces is needed if the Communist parties' strategic line is to be implemented. The fronts and coalitions may differ in character, class composition, and goals of unification. The common and main feature is their anti-imperialist thrust.

Proletarian Internationalism Ensures the Success of All Democratic Movements

Proletarian internationalism is a component of the politics and ideology of the working class. It is one of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. It means solidarity, mutual support, and coordination of the struggle waged by working people of all countries against their common enemy. Proletarian internationalism is radically different from bourgeois nationalism—a policy of racial and national enmity and hatred.

As the struggle of the working class expands and its leading role in the anti-imperialist movements enhances, the content of proletarian internationalism deepens. Socialist internationalism is a manifestation of proletarian internationalism. It underlies the relations between socialist countries, where proletarian internationalism has become a principle of state ideology and policy.

Proletarian internationalism is based on the similarity of interests of various contingents of the international working class which predetermines the necessity of joint struggle against the common enemy and for common aims. Under capitalism, the workers of all countries find themselves in a common position of the exploited. They are exploited by

international capital. They do not own private property (which disunites the people). The process of internationalisation of production, exchange, and the entire public life plays a vital role in furthering proletarian internationalism. The evolution of this process enhances the role of international factors in the revolutionary class struggle. So far, all victorious socialist revolutions have been accomplished with the support of working people in other countries.

Today mankind is passing through a new stage in the internationalisation of public life. In these conditions the role of proletarian internationalism increases. The working class is to accomplish the major historical task of rallying all mankind's progressive forces for the elimination of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

Together with the issues of war and peace, the significance of such global problems as backwardness of developing countries, hunger, raw materials and energy deficit and ecological problems increases. These problems affect all mankind, and unless they are solved humanity cannot advance along the path of social progress.

Only consolidated actions by all nations can withstand the policy of transnational corporations threatening the working people in capitalist, developing and socialist countries, the cause of national independence in all countries.

The consolidation of aggressive forces in the fight against socialism and national liberation movements, and the US imperialism's craving for world hegemony must be opposed by progressive forces everywhere by rallying around the international working-class movement in an effort to frustrate these designs.

Proletarian internationalism is now, as always, combined with the independence of all those participating in the progressive forces' joint struggle.

The very essence of proletarian internationalism, as a revolutionary policy, expresses the similarity of national and international goals of the working class and its party. The character and scope of the contemporary revolutionary process make it a world-scale phenomenon. Still, in each country the revolutionary process develops and unfolds in specific conditions and

is accomplished by domestic social forces. That is why the realisation of this community of national and international is a major prerequisite of success for revolutionary forces. Underestimation of the international factor results in the loss of class positions and the rise of nationalism, while underestimation of the national factor results in the loss of the firm ground of the class struggle.

Communists' internationalism does not conflict with but is closely tied to their patriotism. A Communist party functions primarily as a national organisation, thus making its own contribution to the cause of internationalism.

As internationalists, the Communists are the staunchest champions of the national interests. They defend national interests in the revolutionary struggle (fight for national unity, uphold the country's sovereignty, oppose the threat of aggression, etc.). At the same time, they are careful not to turn their national positions into nationalistic ones. They fight the reactionary forces' attempts to use the development of national self-awareness in the masses for fanning racialism and chauvinism. Communists point out that solutions to national problems are determined by the obtaining social conditions and the extent to which the exploiting system has been eliminated.

Today, when global problems—that of mankind's survival in particular—have acquired special priority, the Communists see that it is possible to rally various social, political, democratic forces, in fact, all forces of peace and progress, on the basis of the anti-war movement.

The communist movement gives extensive support to the national liberation struggle. It stresses the enormous role to be played by this struggle and the importance of solidarity if the victory over imperialism is to be achieved. Also, Communists are sure that solidarity campaigns have a bearing not only on those in whose favour they are staged but also on those who organise them. Internationalism involves the campaigners in politics, raises the level of their political consciousness, makes them realise that all revolutionaries of the world are united by common interests. Internationalism is a school for political education of the masses. It imparts a truly revolutionary character to the class struggle.

Consolidated activities on the part of Communists, needed most of all in such major issues as preservation of peace and frustration of imperialism's aggressive designs, extend the front of anti-imperialist struggle and augment the unity and influence of the communist movement.

Chapter Eight

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

War and Peace Issues After World War II

When World War II was drawing to a close, many thought that this would never happen again and that a stable system of international relations would be built. Nations had paid too big a price for having, in the pre-war years, given imperialism an opportunity to carry out its policy of support for fascism and preparations to procreate a world conflict. This most bloody war in mankind's history took a toll of over 50 million lives and a far greater number of sick and wounded.

Closer to the end of the war, the leaders of the world's first socialist state—the Soviet Union—approached the leaders of major capitalist countries with a proposal to establish good-neighbourly relations. But the United States, Britain, and other capitalist countries did not wish to establish peaceful, let alone good-neighbourly, relations with the Soviet Union. What was the reason?

The bourgeois leaders were frightened by the major world changes in the late 1940s. When the war broke out in 1939, the socialist system consisted only of two states: the USSR and the Mongolian People's Republic. After the war socialism became a world system.

Three great bourgeois powers—Germany, Italy and Japan—suffered a crushing defeat. This weakened the imperialist system as a whole. The Soviet Union's influence and prestige on the international arena grew immensely. The whole world saw that it was the Soviet Union that liberated millions of people enslaved by fascist aggressors. This is why after the war the policies of the Soviet Union, its actions on the inter-

national scene, began to enjoy special respect and support of the world public.

The victory in the war against fascism augmented democracy and progressive forces the world over. The left forces were taking hold of key positions in all realms of political life. Emancipatory movements in colonies and dependencies were on the rise.

All this showed that imperialism's position had gravely deteriorated. Only one country, the United States, had improved its situation both militarily and economically as a result of the war. Its territory suffered no damage from military action or bombings. Also, the war boosted the country's industrial production. By the end of the war, the United States was producing more industrial goods than the rest of the capitalist countries taken together; it owned half of the aggregate gold reserves of the capitalist countries. Besides, the United States was the only country in the world possessing a new and terrible weapon—the atomic bomb.

Even at the time when the war was still raging on and the USSR, the United States and Great Britain were allies in this war, there were influential leaders in both capitalist countries who hoped that the Soviet Union would be bled white. By the end of the war, however, it had become clear, that, notwithstanding the huge losses suffered by the Soviet Union, this socialist state came out of the war immeasurably stronger than it was before the war.

Meanwhile, the big bourgeoisie of the United States and its power-wielding representatives decided that the time was ripe for US monopoly capital to establish its power over the entire world.

They regarded the existence and growing strength of the Soviet Union and the increasing influence of socialism as the chief obstacle to their designs. While the war against a common enemy (the bloc of Axis powers) was on, the members of the anti-fascist coalition—the USSR, United States and Britain—were able to reach agreement on most of the major foreign policy questions. As soon as the military danger was eliminated and the war was over, hostility toward the Soviet socialist state became the central facet of the capitalist states' policies, which began to acquire an openly anti-Soviet character.

In August 1945 the US dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, destroying these two Japanese cities. This was not just another military action but something that signified a switchover to a new policy towards the Soviet Union—a policy of threats and pressure.

Thus commenced a highly dangerous period in international relations—the period of Cold War that lasted 25 years. This period was characterised by the setting up of several imperialist military-political blocs, notably the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (1949), the establishment of numerous military bases around the Soviet Union and other socialist states, and also by the arms race. In the Cold War years, the military-industrial complex (embracing weapons manufacturers, the top brass and higher government officials) exerted enormous influence on the policies of capitalist states. Simultaneously, increasing pressure was brought to bear on left and democratic forces, Communists and peace activists.

During those years, US imperialism resorted several times to armed intervention in various regions of the world. The United States interfered in the Korean conflict and prevented the country's unification (1950-1953), engineered the downfall of the progressive regime in Guatemala (1954), sent an amphibious task force to the Lebanon (1958), dispatched troops to overthrow the democratic government of the Dominican Republic (1965), and from 1964 waged a bloody war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and other Indochinese nations. The United States supported the revanchist policies of the Federal Republic of Germany directed against the German Democratic Republic and for a revision of the results of World War II. It was solely due to US support that Israeli Zionist leaders were able to conduct incessant wars against the Arab people of Palestine and neighbouring Arab states.[1]

All the proposals made by the Soviet Union and other socialist states on normalisation and improvement of relations with

[1] Zionism (from *Zion*—a hill in Jerusalem) is the reactionary ideology and policy of the Jewish bourgeoisie upholding the community of all Jews, irrespective of class affinity, and their settlement in the state of Israel. The Zionist authorities in Israel pursue chauvinistic, anti-Soviet and anti-communist policies.

capitalist countries failed to draw any positive response on the part of the latter.

Meanwhile, the situation was changing. Already by the mid-1950s, a new correlation of forces had shaped in the world.

Socialism had extended beyond the boundaries of one country and become a world system. The share of socialist countries in the world industrial production was constantly growing. Compelled to take part in the arms race, forced on it by imperialism, the Soviet Union demonstrated its ability to respond, in a fairly short time, to any challenge posed by the United States. In 1949 the USSR produced atomic weapons, and in 1956 tested its first intercontinental missile. It meant that the military parity of the two great powers was gradually being forged; so was that of the North Atlantic bloc and the defensive alliance set up by the socialist countries in 1955—the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

The anti-colonial struggle resulted in the emergence of several dozen of newly independent states advocating peace on Earth.

The working-class movement, headed by Communists, and the peace movement made for the isolation of the most aggressive circles in capitalist countries. The more intelligent and sober-minded representatives of the bourgeoisie were beginning to realise that, in the new conditions, a military solution to the historical dispute between capitalism and socialism would end in the wealthy strata perishing together with the working people. Besides, some of them had a stake in developing economic relations with socialist countries.

Because of this, Communists were able to adopt a new approach to the issue of war. The 20th Congress of the CPSU (held in February 1956) decided that world war is preventable. This conclusion is of great theoretical and practical significance. All peace champions were given a clear perspective, and since that time their efforts were aimed not so much at prolonging the period of peace as at banning war once and for all. This idea, advanced by Soviet Communists, was reiterated at international conferences of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1957, 1960 and 1969. At the same time, Communists appealed to all nations not to lose vigi-

lance, since as long as imperialism existed there was always a threat of war.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, a certain shift from Cold War to normalisation and improvement of international relations began to be felt. Due to diplomatic efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist states, and activities by all democratic and peace forces, the USSR was able to achieve a series of important agreements with France, West Germany and the United States. Notably, the 1970 agreement between the USSR and the FRG contained the countries' obligation to renounce the use or threat of force in settling international disputes and their recognition of the existing European borders. The agreements concluded between the USSR and the United States concerned measures to prevent nuclear war and limit the production of nuclear weapons. Of special significance was the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty). The parties to the treaty undertook to possess not more than 200 (100 since 1974) anti-ballistic missile launchers. The treaty prohibited deployment of an anti-ballistic missile defence covering the parties' entire territories: the allowed number of missiles were to be deployed in a specified region. Besides, the ABM Treaty provided that the parties should not "develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based". Economic ties—between socialist and capitalist countries were constantly growing. Thus began a new period in international relations—detente.

One of the greatest achievements of this stage was the conference of 33 European states, the Unites States and Canada, the Final Act of which was signed in Helsinki on August 1, 1975. The principles embodied in this document were to determine the relations among the signatory states: non-use of force or threat of force, inviolability of state borders and peaceful settlement of disputes. The Final Act also contains sections on cooperation in the field of economy, science and technology as well as on the development of contacts between people, improvement of cultural ties and conditions of work of journalists accredited to foreign countries. The Helsinki Conference and its results were a great success for the foreign policy of socialist states, newly independent countries, and all anti-war forces.

Another major achievement of the policy of detente was the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT 2) between the USSR and the USA signed in Vienna in June 1979.

However, at the close of the 1970s, the military-industrial complex—the more aggressive and bellicose section of the monopoly bourgeoisie—invigorated its efforts to thwart detente.

How Imperialism Acts Today

In the late 1977 and early 1978, the US government attempted to deploy neutron weapons on the territories of its European allies. The neutron weapon is a variety of nuclear weapon with a much higher radiation yield than that of other types of nuclear munition. Thanks to the mass protest movement, the US government had to postpone those plans.

The December 1979 NATO Council Session in Brussels approved the deployment of some 600 intermediate range missiles (Pershing-2 and cruise missiles)[1] in Western Europe—weapons capable of reaching economic centres, transportation intersections, and military targets on the European territory of the USSR.

The replacement of Soviet SS-4 and SS-5 missiles by updated SS-20s was used as a pretext for the deployment of qualitatively new types of weapons in Western Europe. In actual fact, the Soviet Union carried out a regular modernisation of its missiles, while the new US missiles were intended to shift the correlation of forces in favour of the United States. The US military had planned that the specific qualities of these new weapons—short flight time (6 to 8 minutes for Pershing-2s) and zigzag flight path (of cruise missiles)—would make it possible to deliver a first, "disabling", blow at the Soviet territory.

In late December 1979, when a limited contingent of Soviet troops was dispatched to Afghanistan to aid the Afghan revolution, the United States used this to justify its large-scale military preparations and to thwart the effective arms limitation treaties.

---

[1] Intermediate- (or medium-) range delivery vehicles are missiles and aircraft with a range capability of 1,000 to 5,000 kilometres.

It was evident that US policies were directed by the most conservative and reactionary circles, those seeking a worldwide social revanche so as to throw mankind a whole epoch back, into the pre-socialist period.

The US Administration jettisoned the US-Soviet SALT 2 accord of 1979. At a new round of talks on strategic nuclear weapons, the American side put forward proposals which, if implemented, would weaken the USSR and disrupt the existing nuclear parity of the two sides.

The United States showed no serious approach to the 1981 Geneva talks on intermediate-range missiles in Europe. It took part in the negotiations just to appease public opinion. It rejected all the compromise proposals advanced by the Soviet Union, and at the end of 1983 started the deployment of its Pershing-2s and cruise missiles in West Germany and cruise missiles in Italy and Britain. It was America's fault that all nuclear arms limitation talks were broken off completely or suspended for a long time.

The US Congress has still not ratified the US-Soviet Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests; the United States disrupted the talks on complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

For imperialism a free hand in the sphere of nuclear weapons is not enough. The so far fruitless talks on the reduction of arms and armaments in Central Europe have been going on for more than ten years. The stockpiling of chemical weapons is continuing at a rapid pace.

In the middle of the 1980s, the US Administration announced plans to militarise outer space. Strike space systems, capable of not only knocking down ballistic missiles in flight but also of hitting ground, sea and air targets, present a grave danger to universal peace.

Militarisation of outer space, as seen by the more aggressive imperialist circles, has three basic objectives: to create a shield from behind which they could deal a nuclear blow at socialist countries and get away with it; build up new types of weapons to thwart the entire process of halting the arms race; and to involve the Soviet Union in an extremely costly arms race which would undermine its economy.

In the 1980s, American imperialism intensified its activities

in regions far beyond the US territory. Without any grounds whatsoever, these regions were declared spheres of US vital interests. Other NATO states are gradually being involved in the US aggressive policies in these regions.

West Germany is becoming increasingly militarised. Japan is being drawn into the arms race, and a military bloc involving the United States, Japan, and South Korea is under way. New US bases and strongpoints are set up in the Pacific and Indian oceans.

Washington has openly declared its "right" to export counter-revolution. Presidential Directive 138, issued in 1984, provides for "pre-emptive strikes" at liberation movements. This approach to international law has found expression in a number of criminal actions carried out by the United States. In 1983, US troops invaded Grenada and eliminated the country's progressive regime. In support of Israel the United States directly interfered in the Middle East conflict, firing from its warships at Lebanese towns and villages. It continues its attempts to overthrow the democratic government in Nicaragua and also its interference in El Salvador's civil war. The mining of Nicaraguan ports in 1984, which killed sailors from many countries, is yet another proof that the United States tends to make international terrorism a government policy. This was vividly demonstrated when US aircraft bombed Libyan cities in April 1986.

In early March 1987, the United States President addressed the country on the radio declaring his administration's intention to exert a more effective influence upon the affairs of Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and other countries conducting policies not to its liking.

US military expenditure is growing at a fast rate. In the 5 years beginning with 1985, Washington plans to spend for military purposes as much as it did from 1946 to 1980. Being developed and deployed are the latest systems of strategic offensive weapons. Thus, the early 1980s saw the imperialist countries led by the US turning round to the policies of stiff confrontation with the socialist countries. This had a negative impact on the internal development of capitalist states, first and foremost on the situation of the working people.

The inordinate and unjustified growth of military spendings

leads to drastic cuts in allocations for social needs. In the United States, Britain, West Germany, Italy and some other countries, the annual growth of military expenditures is accompanied by growing unemployment. Historical records show that no one has yet succeeded in producing "guns and butter" with equal success. The working people are made to pay for the growing number of government military orders through constantly increasing taxes. The arms race also affects the vital interests of the small, middle and a section of the big bourgeoisie involved in domestic production.

The connection between the issues of peace on the one hand, and social progress on the other, and the negative consequences of the imperialist policy of war preparations and arms race are strikingly evident in regions of national struggle for total decolonisation and consolidation of political and economic independence. The arms race forced upon nations by imperialist states has entangled the developing countries as well. Over the years of independence, military expenditure in these countries has increased tenfold and more. These sums are spent on the procurement of arms, primarily from the United States, Britain, France and lately Japan and West Germany. A major share of world arms trade falls on developing countries; the Middle Eastern countries account for nearly half of all arms purchases.

The as yet feeble economies of many developing countries are burdened by huge expenditures on costly weapons and the maintenance of growing armies. In Asia, Africa, and the Middle East the expenditure on a single soldier equals the annual average income of fifteen people.

Regional wars and armed conflicts are especially damaging to the economies of developing countries: 115 of the 120 armed conflicts that occurred in the past 35 years involved African, Asian, and Latin American countries. Since the end of World War II, millions of people have perished in these regions as a result of armed conflicts. Major military conflicts, such as the Israeli aggression against Arab nations and the war between Iraq and Iran, have taken a great toll of human lives and caused huge financial losses.

The arms race consumes enormous amounts of fuel and raw materials, thus increasing the wasteful use of the developing

countries' natural wealth—resources that cannot be replenished. As a result of the arms race triggered by the imperialist states and the attempts to involve developing countries in it, the latter cannot overcome their backwardness. They are compelled to shelve their economic and social plans, put up with unproductive military expenditures and to divert the small contingent of engineering and technical personnel from useful and important endeavours like industrialisation and development of science.

This shows that the imperialist countries' aggressive policies are aimed not only against socialist nations and their own peoples, but also the young independent states in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Communists and Peace

Communists and revolutionary democrats have always favoured peaceful settlement of conflicts involving states with different social systems. The threat of total annihilation of mankind in a nuclear war throws a new light on the basic reason for the communist movement's endeavours. Communists are, as a rule, fighters against oppression and exploitation of man by man. Today, as ever before, they are aware of their historical mission of organising the working class in the struggle to end imperialism's domination. But today ensuring humankind's survival and man's right to life has become a vital priority.

Communists strive to rally all forces, all class and political groupings in the effort to preserve peace on Earth. They work actively among the masses, explaining world political issues and where the threat to peace comes from.

Meetings of Communist Parties in the recent years have been characterised by increased attention to the struggle for peace. Thus, delegates to the May 1986 congress of the German Communist Party spoke in favour of a new policy for safeguarding West Germany's security. They declared that the country's security must be ensured through anti-war endeavours and active disarmament policy in the field of both nuclear and conventional weapons. At their congress in the spring of 1986 Italian Communists opposed the plans to militarise outer space and favoured drastic reductions in nuclear stockpiles and

cessation of military activities in the Mediterranean region.

Communists of India, Japan, Sri Lanka and other countries vigorously advocate peace and oppose imperialism's militarist plans in Asia.

Communists are ready to cooperate with all progressive forces in promoting peace. They stress that there is a close connection between the arms race and the situation of the working people.

The foreign policies of the ruling Communist Parties in the socialist countries have become a major peace factor. The extent to which socialist states are able to influence world developments is largely determined by the degree of their consolidation and ability to act as a single force on the international arena.

The CPSU and Communist Parties of other socialist countries favour full national independence and sovereignty; at the same time, they adhere to Lenin's idea of the closest alliance between proletarian parties based upon full trust, brotherly unity and free will. Inasmuch as this concerns solidarity and unity of action on the part of state and government leaderships, as well as the ties maintained by leading parties and working-class movements, the principle of proletarian internationalism has been further developed. In this particular form it is called "socialist internationalism".

Internationalism is essentially the readiness at any given time, to extend aid and support to each other and all peoples struggling for social and national emancipation. It also means active joint participation in the struggle to preserve and strengthen peace.

The mutual assistance and consolidation of socialist countries in the period of Cold War prevented its development into a "shooting war", made it possible to thwart the designs of imperialist countries aimed against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This allowed to settle a number of practical matters, notably, to help the Democratic Republic of Vietnam defend its freedom and independence in the struggle against US aggression and the German Democratic Republic—to win international recognition. Consolidation, concert, and coordination of foreign policies of the socialist states constituted a major factor in the early 1970s turn for detente.

Imperialists attack the policies of socialist states, especially the internationalist aid rendered to countries fighting for social and national liberation. However, Marxist-Leninist parties and socialist states do not force their assistance on the recipients but render it upon request from revolutionary or emancipatory movements, or ruling Marxist-Leninist parties. All honest democrats and revolutionaries consider such assistance as being fully lawful and justified.

The socialist states have worked out a common approach to one of the most important international political issues—the strengthening of peace and security.

In conditions of imperialism's increased aggressiveness in the 1980s the socialist countries' peaceful foreign policy is called upon to play a crucial role in saving mankind from a nuclear disaster.

The Peace Programme put forward by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1981 contained major concrete proposals. The USSR declared its readiness to negotiate limitation of weapons of all types, notably to come to terms with the United States on restricting the deployment of new submarines.

Of great importance was the Soviet proposal to place a moratorium on the deployment in Europe of new intermediate range nuclear weapons by the NATO countries and the Soviet Union, that is, the freezing of the existing quantitative and qualitative levels of such weapons, including the US forward-based nuclear weapons in this region.

The Peace Programme for the 1980s received wholehearted support at all congresses of the Communist Parties of socialist countries and was welcomed by Communists in capitalist states.

In the spring of 1982, the Soviet government unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear weapons on the European territory of the USSR, and later unilaterally assumed an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Had the United States and other NATO countries followed the Soviet Union's example, the threat of a world thermonuclear catastrophe could have been greatly reduced.

Of great importance is the proposal that the Warsaw Treaty member-states and the NATO countries conclude a treaty on mutual renunciation of the use of military force and on the

maintenance of peaceful relations. The core of this treaty could be a mutual commitment of the member-countries of both alliances not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms against one another and, consequently, not to be the first to use any military force against one another.

At the 1980-83 Madrid meeting of the Helsinki Conference participants the delegations of socialist countries vigorously advocated the convocation of a conference on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe. However, Western countries, led by the United States, tried to turn the Madrid meeting into a "psychological warfare" against the socialist states. Notably the Reagan Administration, supported by some NATO countries, sought to use domestic disturbances in Poland (the activisation of anti-socialist forces in the early 1980s) to unfold a new political and ideological campaign against that country and the Soviet Union.

The socialist countries were able to withstand those attacks and did everything possible to achieve a positive conclusion of the Madrid meeting. It ended with the adoption of a document providing for the convocation, in early 1984, of a conference on measures to promote confidence, security and disarmament in Europe.

Socialist countries were active in their support for plans to create nuclear-free zones in various parts of the European continent, including Northern Europe and the Balkans; they supported the proposal to set up a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe—a region of a particularly high concentration of armed forces and armaments.

Notwithstanding all the protests by socialist states and the mass anti-war movement, the United States deployed intermediate-range missiles in Western Europe in November and December 1983.

When this deployment began the Soviet government, supported by other socialist states, was compelled to take a number of military measures to prevent the United States and NATO from attaining superiority over the Soviet Union and its allies. The Soviet Union lifted in March 1982 its unilateral moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear weapons on the European part of its territory and commenced the deployment of longer-range tactical missiles in the German Democratic

Republic and Czechoslovakia. Soviet nuclear-powered missile submarines were moved closer to the US coast and their number was increased.

The situation in the world was gravely endangered when, in the mid-1980s, the United States began to implement its plans for militarisation of outer space. The leaders of socialist countries are well aware that the utilisation of scientific and technological achievements for this purpose is leading the world to disaster.

As pointed out in the new edition of the CPSU Programme, adopted by the 27th Party Congress in 1986, a global conflict could neither be won nor lost but might destroy the entire human civilisation.

The Soviet leadership considers that the present conditions require a new approach to foreign policy matters, and that the security of states cannot be ensured by military means or armed force.

On Soviet initiative negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on the prevention of an arms race in space and its cessation on Earth began in Geneva in March 1985. The USSR proposed an agreement on a total prohibition of space strike weapons. However, the course of the negotiations showed that the United States was unwilling to drop its plans to militarise outer space.

In August 1985 the Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions and subsequently extended it until August 1986.

In response to those peace initiatives the US Administration sanctioned tests of the anti-satellite system, accelerated the deployment of Pershing-2s in Europe, and adopted a record high military budget.

In those complicated conditions, a meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States—General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan—took place in Geneva in November 1985. At that meeting the two leaders did not settle the questions pertaining to the cessation of the arms race. The US side reaffirmed the determination to implement its plan for developing space weapons (the "Star Wars" programme, as it came to be called in the Western press). At the same time,

it was pointed out in the joint statement by General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan that a nuclear war must never be started and that there could be no winners in such a war; both sides pledged not to strive for military superiority. They spoke in favour of banning and eliminating chemical weapons. Of great importance was the agreement to continue political contacts, including at the summit level.

The Soviet side has shown that it is fully aware that the present-day situation in the world is fraught with grave consequences, and that it is determined to do all it can to save life on Earth. In view of this, the historic proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev on January 15, 1986 acquire particular importance. These proposals aim at eliminating nuclear weapons completely by the end of the 20th century.

Soviet Communists fully realise their responsibility for the fate of mankind; this has found graphic expression in the decisions adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress in February and March 1986, and also subsequent decisions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It was said at the Congress that the development and further modernisation of missiles and other nuclear weapons, plans for extending the arms race to space, and growing global problems forcefully posed the question of the survival of humanity, of the preservation of civilisation. The real threat to life on Earth demands of politicians and peoples a new approach to the solution of important international problems, a new thinking. The CC Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress said that our planet "cannot be saved and preserved if the way of thinking and actions built up over the centuries on the acceptability and permissibility of wars and armed conflicts are not shed once and for all, resolutely and irrevocably".

New thinking as Soviet Communists see it should be based on an unqualified renunciation of war and power politics. Statesmen must realise that a nuclear war cannot be won, that there would be neither winners nor losers in it but only dead people. The conflicts existing in the world in this nuclear and space age should be settled solely by political means, by negotiation and compromise, and not by military means. The negotiating parties should proceed from the need to maintain the existing rough military strategic parity (equality).

New thinking connotes realisation of the close interconnection and interdependence of all nations. No nation can achieve security at the expense of other nations, for security can only be identical, reciprocal and comprehensive. Every nation should certainly see to its interests but not at the expense of other nations.

Recognition of the balance of interests and the need for mutual confidence should pervade every aspect of international relations from military-political to humanitarian and cultural ones.

Attention is drawn first of all to the Fundamental Principles of a Comprehensive System of International Security, put forward at the Congress. These principles include renunciation by the nuclear powers of war against each other or other countries and also prevention of arms race in outer space. The CPSU was the first to put forth the idea of equal economic security for all states (guaranteed by the establishment of a new economic order, just settlement of the problem of debts, resolution of global problems) as a relevant component of a system of stable security.

The Soviet Union has proposed a reduction in the stockpiles of both nuclear and conventional arms. This is particularly important in view of the fact that the USSR's alleged superiority in conventional weapons is used as a pretext for further buildup of nuclear weapons.

A major step toward arms limitation was made by the Warsaw Treaty Organisation in the summer of 1986. The Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee proposed large-scale reductions in the European arms and armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals. The proposal envisages a mutual reduction of the armed forces of the two opposing military-and-political alliances by a total of 1 million officers and men—500 thousand on each side.

The Soviet Union agrees that control over reduction be carried out both with the help of national technical means and through on-site inspections. This has left the opponents of disarmament without one of their trump cards.

At the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, Soviet representatives made a major contribution to the achievement of

general agreement and development of confidence-building measures. At the November 1986 Vienna conference, which continued the work begun at the Stockholm conference, Soviet representatives conducted diplomatic struggle for a headway in the cause of tangible reduction of armaments in Europe.

In spite of the fact that the United States declined to follow the Soviet Union's example and terminate nuclear explosions, the USSR extended its unilateral moratorium several times. All those important proposals and initiatives were rejected by Washington. Nations could see again where the threat to peace comes from.

The CPSU and the Soviet government have declared in clear and unequivocal terms that they will not allow a disruption of the existing approximate parity between the forces of the two states, and that any attempt to achieve military superiority will meet with an effective response on the part of the Soviet Union.

The development of international relations in the 1980s has given us impressive examples of the firm and consistent efforts by socialist states to uphold peace and save mankind from nuclear disaster.

When the Soviet-US talks on arms limitation and prohibition of militarisation of outer space reached a deadlock, Mikhail Gorbachev suggested that himself and President Reagan should meet without delay. This proposal was made in September 1986. The meeting between the two leaders took place in the capital of Iceland, Reykjavik, on October 11 and 12, 1986. The Soviet side advanced the following major proposals: (1) to reduce all strategic arms by 50 per cent; (2) to eliminate all Soviet and US intermediate-range missiles in Europe, and to begin immediate negotiations on this type of missiles in Asia and on missiles with a range of less than 1,000 km; (3) to consolidate the regime of the ABM Treaty and open negotiations on the total prohibition of nuclear explosions. The sides reached a rapprochement on a number of issues, but had not succeeded in fixing these agreements in a treaty. This may be attributed to the American side's persistent desire to deploy its strike weapons in outer space.

Subsequently, the US leaders strove to justify their position in Reykjavik. Notably, assertions were spread to the effect

that it had been the threat of deployment of weapons in outer space that had compelled the Soviet Union to negotiate. In actuality, termination of the arms race has for several dozen years invariably constituted the general line of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, just as it does today. The United States had advanced certain "preliminary conditions" for a Soviet-US treaty on nuclear weapons. The United States, declared the Washington leaders, must first see a "change of political climate in the Soviet Union"—an obviously far-fetched pretence.

Right after the Reykjavik talks, the US Administration advanced a "broader interpretation" of the ABM Treaty, which was tantamount to a *de facto* violation of the treaty provisions. This, in the opinion of the US leadership, would legalise militarisation of outer space.

In the end of 1986, President Reagan declared that the United States was withdrawing from SALT-2—a major document on limitation of strategic nuclear arms. The Soviet government remained firm. It announced that despite the stand taken by the United States the Soviet Union would continue to abide by the terms of the treaty. The USSR extended its moratorium on nuclear explosions until the end of 1986, and in the early 1987 announced its decision to prolong the period of the moratorium until the first nuclear explosion in the United States. The underground nuclear explosion in the United States, on 3 February 1987, frustrated the major USSR peace initiative which could have laid the ground for termination of nuclear arms race. Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of 28 February 1987 was a vivid manifestation of the Soviet Union's persistent desire to impel the West to take practical steps in this direction. The Soviet leader announced the Soviet Union's readiness to resolve the issue of the medium-range missiles in the European zone separately, without a direct link to problems related to the package of disarmament issues, and to conclude a separate agreement on Euromissiles. This proposal (just like the Soviet proposals in Reykjavik) envisages total elimination of the sides' intermediate-range missiles in Europe within 5 years. Within the same period, the number of Soviet missiles of this type deployed on the Soviet Asian territory is to be brought down to 100 warheads, with the

same number of warheads deployed on the territory of the United States.

The proposal was widely supported in many countries, and gave a new impetus to arms limitation talks.

Normalisation of the situation in the Asian Pacific region constitutes a major part of the CPSU's foreign policy course. For many decades now, the United States has been following the line of militarising this region, dispatching to the Indian and Pacific oceans ever new aircraft carriers and dozens of submarines with nuclear weapons. The US "atomic fist" threatens the Soviet Far East and all countries of the region whose policies are not to its liking.

The statements made by Mikhail Gorbachev during his Vladivostok tour and his visit to India contained proposals on an Asian forum to work out joint solutions to the region's problems; on settlement of regional conflicts, demilitarisation of the Indian Ocean, termination of nuclear buildup in this area, etc. The Delhi Declaration signed by Mikhail Gorbachev and the Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi deals primarily with the principles of building a world free from nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union is the first nuclear power to sign Protocols 2 and 3 to the Raratonga Treaty—which declared the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone—and undertook to observe the status of the zone.

The Soviet government is doing all in its power to improve the situation around Afghanistan. In the late 1986, six Soviet regiments were withdrawn from Afghanistan. Soviet leadership fully supports the efforts of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to attain national reconciliation. Important negotiations have taken place between Soviet leaders and diplomats with representatives of Pakistan, Iran, and other states whose positions have a bearing on the settlement of the problems around Afghanistan.

The Soviet Union attaches considerable importance to cooperation with People's Mongolia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea.

The Soviet Union has intensified its effort to improve relations with China, Japan, and Indonesia.

Relations between socialist countries and newly independent

states are of major significance to the cause of peace and emancipatory struggle.

The Marxist-Leninist parties and governments of socialist states have had an important part to play in liberating Asian and African countries from colonial oppression. They have done a great deal to make the United Nations Organisation come out in favour of a total elimination of all colonial regimes.

The Soviet Union supported the struggles for independence waged in Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Algeria, Indochina and many other countries. When new, sovereign, states emerged the Soviet Union, followed by other socialist countries, rendered them comprehensive moral, political and economic support. Socialist countries have helped a number of young states to build up people's armies. Today, it is highly important to frustrate imperialism's plans to alienate the young independent states from the socialist countries.

The socialist countries are the nonaligned movement's natural allies in the fight for peace and against neocolonialism. The socialist states' demands concerning the establishment of a security system in Asia and the lessening of military activities in the Indian Ocean and other regions meet with the approval of newly independent states, particularly those with socialist orientation. This refers, first and foremost, to the Middle East where Israeli aggression, supported by the United States, has created a situation which threatens world peace.

The Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty member-states, hold that stable and just peace in the Middle East is possible only if a number of conditions are observed. Above all else, it is necessary to strictly observe the principle of territorial inviolability; all Arab territories occupied by Israel must be returned to their lawful owners, and the borders between Israel and its Arab neighbours must be proclaimed inviolable. The Arab people of Palestine must, in fact, be given the right to self-determination, to the establishment of their own sovereign state on Palestinian lands to be freed from Israeli occupation. The Israeli-occupied East Jerusalem must be returned to the Arabs. It is also necessary to provide for believers freedom of access to the sacred sites of three religions in Jerusalem. Socialist governments believe that all the states in the region have the right to a secure and independent existence and devel-

opment. The state of war must be ended and peace established between the Arab states and Israel. To uphold peace in this region, it would be necessary to elaborate and adopt international settlement guarantees. Such guarantees may be developed and implemented only through the joint efforts of all the interested parties—and this must necessarily include the Palestine Liberation Organisation as the sole lawful representative of the Arab people of Palestine.

Peace Can Be Safeguarded

Communists believe that, notwithstanding the grave international situation, it is possible to prevent a catastrophe. What gives them hope is, primarily, the might of the Soviet Union, the economic and military strength of the socialist community, the vigorous and coordinated policies of socialist states and their constructive proposals aimed at lessening tension and ending the arms race.

A major peace factor today is the international communist movement—a force persuing a consistent anti-war course and the struggle for peace as the core of its activity.

Also constituting another peace factor are more than 100 young independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The majority of these countries—former colonies of imperialist powers—are faced with immensely difficult problems inherited from their colonial past. These problems—economic backwardness, shortage of scientific and technical personnel, low literacy of the population, constant hunger and malnutrition—require a lengthy period of peaceful development for their solution. Preservation of universal peace is in the interest of developing countries. These states constitute the majority of influential Nonaligned Movement, which has been increasingly asserting itself not only as an anti-war but also as an anti-imperialist force. Countries with socialist orientation are the developing countries' vanguard.

The section of the capitalist class which has no stake in the arms race and war also constitutes a solid peace factor. The realistic-minded representatives of the bourgeoisie realise that a nuclear war will end in disaster. Besides, they are dissatisfied with the channelling of budget allocations into the military in-

dustry. Their opposition to their governments' adventurist policy of war preparations has a serious impact on public opinion in the United States, Britain and other countries.

Mass democratic movements encompassing a great variety of forces make tangible contributions to the cause of peace. Their activities are based on profound and long-term factors. These movements emerged as the broad popular masses' response to the increasingly reactionary and aggressive character of imperialism and the deepening crisis of the capitalist economic system. These movements are not time-serving. They show that revolt against reaction, the inherent vices and the very foundations of the exploiter system is developing among the popular masses. This revolt is expressed in the attitudes of the movements' representatives, notably, in the fact that they advance major demands and find effective ways of fighting for their implementation. Many movements of this kind sprang up in the 1970s, particularly in the advanced capitalist countries. They differ from one another in immediate goals, numerical strength and forms of activity.

One of the major reasons for the emergence of mass movements is people's concern about the fate of the world. At the same time, people unite and persistently demand solutions to serious social problems relating to employment, education, social security, housing, leisure-time, etc.

One of the largest is the ecological movement (called Greens) which is particularly active in West Germany, Austria, Switzerland and other countries. The Greens have declared that their central objective is protection of the environment, preservation of natural wealth and a climate favourable for human existence. They are against air and water pollution, as well as ruthless exploitation of natural resources. The movement is rapidly growing. The ranks of their supporters increase even faster, which is explained by the consistent anti-war character of their demands. In a number of states, this has made it possible for the Greens to develop into political parties which win considerable votes during parliamentary and municipal elections.

The ecological movement has close links with broad civil initiatives movements, which emerged as a result of protests against the contemporary bourgeois state incapable of resolving problems of housing, education, recreation, improvement of

services and utilities, communal services, etc. These movements vigorously oppose the setting up of military projects in their countries and within the vicinity of their cities. They are bent on declaring their cities non-nuclear zones.

Protest against the policies of the bourgeois state is also characteristic of the "alternative movements". Young men and women, mostly students, constitute the majority in these movements. Their protests are directed against corruption and the waning role of elective bodies. They oppose the red tape pervading public schools and shallow culture. They advocate development of cultural values. They seize vacant buildings and turn them into youth hostels with the aim of doing away with alienation. The participants demand that the fruits of scientific and technological progress be utilised to serve social objectives instead of raising monopolies' superprofits and financing weapons modernisation.

General mass democratic movements involving various sections of the population have of late become widespread not only in Western Europe and advanced capitalist countries but have also become an important form of struggle in Latin American, Asian and African countries. They embrace movements of solidarity with nations fighting for their rights and national independence; campaigns of solidarity with victims of imperialist aggression, fascist regimes and reaction; mass protests against reactionary and fascist regimes and aimed at removing militarist circles of the ruling classes from power so as to restore and develop a democratic system; mass demonstrations supporting the liberation of national territories from the occupation by foreign troops and military bases; mass manifestations in support of territorial integrity; movements for democratisation of international relations, in particular international economic relations, for a new world economic order, etc.

The participants do not, as a rule, link their demands with radical transformation of society; rather, they try to resolve the problems within the framework of the existing social order. Many of their aspirations are of a utopian character and cannot be realised under capitalism. Some of the demands defy technological progress and are linked with utopian hopes for a return to former, long-gone, conditions. Far from all the participants realise that their activities are of social character. Still, their

actions undermine imperialism, and promote the revolutionary process.

Communists and revolutionary democrats are well aware of the role played by the mass movements in the anti-imperialist struggle. They take into consideration the capabilities and the weaknesses of these movements: their complex composition and the contradictory nature of their demands. Motley and contradictory as the slogans put forward by these movements are, revolutionary parties know that they are generally directed against imperialism and war. That is why they take active part in these movements, trying to make them more effective and purposeful.

Communists consider it their task to effectively and constructively contribute to the accomplishment of the goals set by the movements. At the same time, they try to help the participants see the real reasons behind the developments that have caused these mass protests and correctly identify those who are to blame for them; they help the participants shed anti-Soviet and anti-communist prejudices. Revolutionary parties see their central objective (so far as the general democratic movements are concerned) in enhancing the contribution of the working class to their struggle. They help participants of the mass movements accumulate political experience—an important facet in the formation of anti-imperialist and, subsequently, anti-capitalist political consciousness.

The general democratic movements are becoming a school for political experience; their participants are beginning to understand the cardinal problems of our day. The existence of mass democratic movements shows that new tendencies are developing within the world revolutionary process and that its social base is expanding.

The major one is the anti-war movement, which embraces many millions of people representing all social classes. The massive popular protests in the 1980s against the deployment of new US missiles in Europe, and later for their removal, have significantly changed the political climate on the European continent.

The movement has found some new forms of struggle: permanent peace camps in the vicinity of US bases, peace marches, blocking of roads leading to military bases, etc.

The ruling circles of NATO states had hoped that when the actual deployment began, the protests would be dampened and anti-war campaigners would accept the course of events forced on them. They miscalculated. The struggle is still going on.

The question arises whether the anti-war movement is a class organisation constituting part of the working-class movement.

Marxist-Leninist parties hold that the anti-war movement is a general democratic movement. Its central objective is prevention of a world war, the saving of world civilisation. It does not aim at changing the social system (the objective of the workers' and Communist movement).

Its composition also displays a general-democratic character, since it embraces workers, farmers, intellectuals, urban petty and middle bourgeoisie, and even a section of the big bourgeoisie.

It must be pointed out in this connection that the communist participants in the movement are faced with responsible and complicated tasks—to make every effort to expand the base of the movement and arm it with the appropriate slogans. This is not an easy task, considering the motley composition of the anti-war movement and attempts by various political forces to seize key positions in it.

The motley composition, coupled with activities of Western special services and the reactionary mass media, sometimes leads to circulation of incorrect views and opinions. One of these is the false conclusion concerning the source of the existing and growing threat of war.

The thesis of "equal responsibility" of the USSR and the United States for the thwarting of detente in late 1970s and early 1980s has acquired a fairly wide currency. This contradicts the actual state of things. In the USSR, there are no social groups with a stake in militarisation or arms race. The Soviet Union has no military-industrial complex raking profits from the arms race.

The Soviet Union proposed a ban on atomic weapons when it possessed no such weapons and even after it had built the atomic bomb. The United States turned down all Soviet proposals to ban and eliminate these weapons.

The USSR has invariably been second in the arms race; it

has never initiated new types of weapons as the United States has done on several occasions.

The Soviet Union was four years behind the United States in atomic weapons, roughly five in strategic bombers and nuclear-powered submarines. The United States was the first (despite all Soviet proposals and warnings) to produce MIRVed warheads. In 1981, the United States started full-scale production of neutron weapons and thereafter of binary chemical weapons.[1]

The Soviet Union was, therefore, obliged to respond to the actions of the other side—which strove to initiate a new stage in the arms race.

Considering the "equal" or "unequal" responsibility of the sides, it is relevant to compare the major trends in the two superpowers' foreign and military policies of the 1970s and 1980s.

While it accuses the Soviet Union of "international terrorism" for supporting liberation movements, the extremist circles in the United States actually conduct state terrorism in Central America, the Middle East and in other regions.

While the Soviet Union assumed an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the United States leadership declared America's 'right' to a first nuclear strike.

The Soviet leadership suggested that nuclear powers define a code of conduct guaranteeing against misuse of the gigantic destructive forces in their possession, but no response whatsoever came from the US side.

Therefore, there are no grounds for the thesis of "equal responsibility" of the two superpowers for the frustration of detente and creation of dangerous international tensions.

The greatest hopes for the preservation of peace are based on unity of action and consolidation of all anti-war forces at both the national and international levels.

The Communists' peace effort is a great unification factor. The Communist Parties of socialist states try to rally all forces capable of preventing the world from sliding to the brink

[1] Binary chemical weapons contain two separate chemical components harmless by themselves but producing a highly poisonous gas when they come together.

of disaster. They are at one with the mass anti-war movements that have unfolded in many countries. In view of this, they appeal for joint action to Social-Democratic Parties, the Socialist International, trade unions and other public organisations. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union calls on all Socialists and Social Democrats, all working-class and democratic movements to increase their efforts to save mankind from a nuclear disaster and raise the initiative of popular masses and public organisations in the struggle for peace and detente.

Socialist countries are ready to join efforts with all states irrespective of their socio-political systems, with all those who advocate peace and international security, to take practical measures to avert a global catastrophe.

CONCLUSION

We live in a stormy age of social upheavals. Socialism was once a dream. In the 19th century Marxism turned it into a science. In the 20th century the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia and the establishment of the world socialist system have made socialism a reality for millions upon millions of working people. The building of socialism, a new society, involves more than 1.5 billion people. The majority of the world's population are, in fact, engaged in the struggle for national liberation or revolutionary transformations in the newly independent states. The anti-war movement embraces even a larger number of people: it has gripped all continents and regions of the world.

Thus, the majority of mankind link their future with the anti-imperialist struggle, with socialism, in the final count. Socialist orientation determines the contemporary revolutionary process and the development of the world today.

To put it differently, our age marks the triumph of Marxism-Leninism. Its attractiveness and vitality are explained by the fact that it is materialist teaching with a solid foundation of scientific knowledge verified by revolutionary experience. It is a dialectic teaching the principles and laws of which reflect the objective development of the world. It is a humanistic teaching which regards man as a supreme and eternal social value. It is a creative teaching providing not cut-and-dried dogmas, but starting points for further research and practical activity. It is a proletarian teaching, an ideological manifestation of the political interests of the working class—the most advanced and influential social force of our day—and

of all the working people. It is a revolutionary teaching holding that a social revolution is the only possible form of transition to a new society. It is a teaching orienting mankind on a communist perspective. It is an international teaching that rallies all progressive forces of our time in the struggle against imperialist and reactionary forces, for peace, democracy and social progress.

As an advanced scientific theory Marxism-Leninism relies on the wealth of experience accumulated in the course of revolutionary struggle and socialist construction. The Great October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet people and the party founded by Lenin commenced a new era in mankind's history.

In the course of the great class battles of the 20th century, revolutionaries have amassed rich experience which is an invaluable contribution to the treasure-house of Marxism-Leninism, international communist and working-class movement and the national-liberation movement.

This experience enables us to draw some important conclusions.

Victorious socialist revolutions have shown that the power of exploiters is not eternal, that it can and must be replaced with a government of the working people. The working class, in alliance with the peasantry and other working people, has used its power to turn socialist states into countries with highly developed industries and agriculture.

Cultural revolution was a continuation of the political revolution. For the first time in human history the working people have been emancipated spiritually in the socialist countries. They are actively involved in the political and cultural life of their countries and in the production of spiritual values. A new—socialist—type of intelligentsia has come into being.

The victory of socialist revolutions was also victory in the struggle for national emancipation.

It has become possible to exercise in full man's rights and freedoms, to place man in the focus of society's attention, and to satisfy people's increasing material and spiritual needs.

The experience amassed by revolutionaries in all countries has confirmed the theory that the toiling masses need a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party. It is needed not only for the

purpose of gaining political power, but also for building a just—socialist—society.

Marxism-Leninism is the sole theoretical basis for successful activities of revolutionary parties. Developing Marxism-Leninism theoretically and applying it in practice, revolutionary parties work out the correct strategy and tactics, are able to operate in the most difficult and complicated situations, and to rebuff hostile attacks directed at the Marxist-Leninist teaching.

Like any other science, Marxism-Leninism is constantly developing; it is enriched by new conclusions and generalisations. The strategy of accelerating socio-economic development worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress; the current socialist construction in a number of countries in European, Asian and American continents, revolutionary changes taking place in some socialist-oriented countries; intensification of the class struggle in capitalist countries—all this enriches Marxism-Leninism and gives further impetus to the progress of socialism world-wide.

Marxism-Leninism was, is, and will be a powerful weapon in the hands of the proletariat and all the oppressed people in the struggle for liberation and creation of a just social system—socialism. One of the most important tasks facing revolutionary parties is to inculcate Marxism-Leninism in their members and spread Marxist-Leninist ideas among the working people.

The experience accumulated by revolutionaries shows that a revolutionary party's role in society increases as the objectives of class struggle are accomplished. This does not occur spontaneously. The party must always be able to resolve problems posed before it. To raise a revolutionary party's militancy, it is necessary to further enhance the life-proved principle of democratic centralism, to ensure its constant application—naturally, closely combined with adherence to Marxist-Leninist ideology, strict observance of Leninist standards of party life and principles of party leadership. Revolutionary parties wage unflagging struggle to preserve and consolidate their ideological and organisational unity and against various opportunistic trends, factions and groupings.

The strength of the Marxist-Leninist parties lies in close

and firm ties with the masses. The people are a strong force if rallied around revolutionary parties. The experience accumulated by the CPSU and other Communist and Workers' parties proves this. The connection between revolutionary parties and the masses is vital at all times. To make it stronger, the parties work permanently among all sections and groups of the population.

Today, it is especially important to invigorate the policy of alliances pursued by Communist and Workers' parties, which is essentially aimed at extending socialist ideas to the non-proletarian population and drawing ever broader masses into the struggle for social progress. These aims cannot be attained if Communists do not play an independent and leading role in each of these alliances.

The experience of the CPSU and other ruling Communist and Workers' parties demonstrates that when the working people assume power, planned development of the national economy—in particular the production and distribution of goods essential to the existence of millions upon millions of people—becomes the primary task. This task cannot be accomplished without active participation of the working masses.

Revolutionary parties have amassed a wealth of experience in industrialisation, socialist transformation of agriculture, cultural revolution, elimination of national oppression, and establishment of equality and friendly relations among peoples. This experience constantly grows richer in the course of revolutionary endeavours of socialist-oriented countries pursued with due account of the national and historical conditions of countries and regions.

One of the most important lessons drawn by the revolutionaries is the objective necessity to defend the revolution and the socialist society with arms. Revolutionaries always bear this in mind and, in view of the increased aggressiveness of imperialism, are always prepared to rebuff imperialism and deal it a crushing blow.

The extent to which a revolutionary party influences the historical development of its country depends largely on the degree of its adherence to proletarian internationalism. As already mentioned above, the importance of this factor

has greatly increased in contemporary conditions.

Today, as never before, success of the revolutionary struggle depends on Communists' international solidarity, specifically, consolidation of cooperation between the Communist Parties of the socialist countries; active support on the part of all Communists and revolutionary democrats for those contingents of the liberation movement which are under the severe pressure of reactionaries; and, of course, on extensive cooperation involving Communist and Workers' parties, revolutionaries and all people of goodwill in the struggle against war, for preventing a thermonuclear holocaust.

Communist Parties and the entire revolutionary movement are a major factor of social progress. To strengthen all forces within the revolutionary movement and the ties between them is to advance the common cause of international working class, the cause of peace and socialism.

Socialism is invincible. The goal set by Communists is the building of communist society, which is the higher stage of socialism.

Only communism can fully accomplish the cardinal problems of social development and rid mankind of oppression, exploitation, hunger, poverty, militarism and war once and for all. Only communism is capable of ensuring a new life built on the foundations of democracy, peace and friendship among nations.

First and foremost, communism will ensure eternal peace on our planet. It will end the long history of human suffering. It will stop the senseless waste of human energy in the production of means of destruction. New prospects for the development of science and technology will open up.

Peace will create conditions for the flourishing of human society, the flourishing of culture and the arts. This will be accomplished by free and creative labour. Labour will constitute the chief content of life, the sense of every person's life.

The collective effort of all society will create an abundant flow of goods essential to the life of people. Under communism, said Marx, people will live in plenty.

A source of wealth, labour will also become a source of pleasure for each person, the vital need of every member of communist society.

This kind of labour will develop man's abilities. Labour

will be the means of expressing these abilities. People will fully exercise their capabilities, master various professions, combine work with love for art, science, and sport.

The basic principle of communism will be implemented: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.

Under socialism, people get equal remuneration for equal labour. This expresses the just character of socialist society with its absence of exploitation and inequality inherent in capitalist society. In socialist society, as in any other society, people demonstrate different abilities to various degrees. Other life circumstances vary, too: some have large families, others have none; some have two children, others—five. Therefore, even if the pay is equal, conditions of life are different.

The introduction of the communist principle—to each according to his needs—eliminates this inequality and enables everyone to satisfy his needs. This is supreme justice, the really humane ideal of equality: let everyone give society all he can, and society will meet all the reasonable needs.

The idea of communist equality has nothing whatsoever in common with the desire to destroy human individuality. The desire to turn all working people into what actually amounts to robots serving capital is characteristic of contemporary capitalism. Such views are also circulated by some of those who call themselves revolutionaries. Marx, in his time, called them proponents of "barrack communism". Communism establishes equality through elimination of socio-economic and cultural differences in the conditions of life and work.

Inequality in the social position of women will also be eliminated. Women will be given every opportunity to develop their abilities and engage in various kinds of social activities.

Only free men are equal. Therefore, communism guarantees genuine freedom for all. Man becomes free already at the stage of socialist revolution, since it frees him from exploitation.

Genuine freedom means respect not only for one's own rights but also for the rights of others. Hence the need to coordinate one's activities with other people's efforts, the endeavours of one's collective and, in fact, all society. Under

communism, there will be no difference between personal and public interests. Men of communist future will understand freedom as possibility of acting for the benefit of all.

Equality and freedom establish the brotherhood of all working people, all nations.

The combination of all communist principles—peace, labour, equality, freedom and brotherhood—will make all people happy in the fullest sense of this word.

An old legend has it that Prometheus broke Zeus's order that humans should not be given fire. By giving them light and warmth, Prometheus saved humankind.

Communists and revolutionaries are the Prometheuses of our day. They give people the light of Marxism-Leninism and belief in the future.

For breaking Zeus's order, Prometheus was chained and sentenced to suffering. The masters of the capitalist world will not be able to cope with the Prometheuses of our day. Revolutionaries are armed with the advanced scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, which relies on the wealth of experience accumulated in the revolutionary struggle, and is constantly developed and enriched.

TO THE READER

Dear friend!

You have almost turned the last page.

We are grateful to you for your time and effort.

As authors, we would be pleased if you liked this book. We are, however, fully aware of its drawbacks and the impossibility of setting forth all or even the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism in this small book.

The important thing is whether you would like to go on studying the revolutionary theory. If you intend to do so then the authors have attained their goal.

We would like to advise those who want to continue the study not to be afraid of difficulties. No one can hope to absorb knowledge at a go. To master Marxism-Leninism one must be firm and diligent, consider each issue at various angles, read a lot of not only textbooks but also works by the founders of this theory, party documents and theoretical studies.

You must always try to apply the theory you have learned to concrete situations obtaining in your country and region, to specific tasks facing the revolutionaries. The study of the theory of Marxism-Leninism is needed to guide you in practical work. Without this work, without struggle, knowledge acquired from books will be nothing else but the study of formulae and slogans. Theory must be necessarily linked with revolutionary practice.

Your task is to acquire a profound understanding of the essence of Marxism-Leninism. For this, you may study the spiritual wealth created by mankind.

This task cannot be settled at one stroke but through regular and diligent effort.

The success of this effort depends on the student himself. The important thing is to learn to understand the problems of social life.

Only one's own effort will turn knowledge into conviction. Convictions that have developed as a result of independent quest and hard work become the foundation of one's position in life.

The development of Marxist-Leninist outlook will not take place as a result of passive assimilation of ready-made knowledge.

We advise each student of this theory to soberly reflect on the acquired knowledge, to keep asking himself: Why is it so? He may constantly discuss the theory with his comrades and try and apply it to reality.

We suggest that students begin with the classical works: *Communist Manifesto* by Marx and Engels, *"Left-Wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder* by Lenin, programme documents and other materials of Communist and Workers' parties, materials relating to regional and multilateral meetings of representatives of revolutionary parties.

For a better understanding of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, we recommend that students study *Theses on Feuerbach* by Marx and Lenin's works *The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism* and *Karl Marx.*

The economic theory of Marxism-Leninism can be studied only on the basis of Marx' *Capital* and Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism.*

We would like to lay stress on Lenin's works devoted to the problems of revolutionary process in developing countries. They are: *Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions, Material for the Second Congress of the Communist International, Report of the Commission on the National and the Colonial Questions* and others. To understand the policy pursued by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government with the aim of strengthening peace and the security of nations, it is rather important to study the materials of the 27th CPSU Congress and other documents relating to the problems of peace and security

published in the USSR and other socialist countries in recent years.

We wish you, dear reader, every success in your work!

To learn from Marx, Engels and Lenin is to safeguard and enrich the ideological and moral wealth of the immortal doctrine. It means living and working as Marx, Engels and Lenin taught. It means trying to follow their example in everything, adhering to Marxist-Leninist principles of justice, comradeship, and an active social attitude.

All over the world, millions upon millions of fighters for social and national emancipation are learning the great theory of transforming the world. This graphically proves that the Earth's future is socialism.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Fundamentals of Scientific Socialism

The handbook deals with the main theoretical concepts of scientific socialism — a system of knowledge about the universal laws of society's development, the working people's struggle, the ways and methods of transforming the world of exploitation and violence into a society of freedom, equality and justice.

The authors elaborate on the contribution of Marx, Engels, and Lenin to the revolutionary theory, and on the fusion of scientific socialism with the practical struggle of the working class and all working people against exploitation and oppression, for a socialist society, peace and social progress.

Progress Publishers

ISBN 5-01-000446-1